

Gravitational Correspondence of Two Types of Superconformal Anomaly

W.F. Chen[†]

Department of Mathematics

Wilfrid Laurier University

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

and

Physics Division

National Center for Theoretical Sciences

Hsinchu, Taiwan, R.O.C.

Abstract

In a classical conformal invariant supersymmetric gauge theory, the chiral R -symmetry current j^μ , the supersymmetry current s^μ and the energy-momentum tensor $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ constitute a supercurrent multiplet. There are two different superconformal anomaly multiplets in four-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theories, one originating from the supersymmetric gauge dynamics and the consequent nonvanishing β -function, and the other one coming from the coupling of the supercurrent multiplet to the external supergravity multiplet with non-trivial topology. We emphasize that in the gauge/gravity dual correspondence these two types of superconformal anomaly multiplets have distinct reflections in the classical supergravity: the anomaly multiplet due to the supersymmetry gauge dynamics is dual to the spontaneous symmetry breaking and the consequent super-Higgs effect in AdS_5 bulk supergravity, while the anomaly multiplet originating from the non-trivial topology of external conformal supergravity multiplet is a boundary effects of the AdS_5 space.

I. INTRODUCTION

In Ref. [1], Klebanov, Ouyang and Witten has investigated the gravity dual of the chiral $U_R(1)$ symmetry anomaly in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ cascading $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ supersymmetric gauge theory using the gauge theory/gravity duality correspondence [2–4]. They showed that on the gravity side the chiral $U_R(1)$ -symmetry anomaly of above supersymmetric gauge theory is a classical feature and behaves as a spontaneous breaking of gauge symmetry in the $\mathcal{N} = 2$

[†]E-mail: wchen@wlu.ca, wfchen@phys.cts.nthu.edu.tw

$U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity. This statement is supported by the observation that the vector field dual to the R -symmetry current of the supersymmetric gauge theory has got a mass through a Higgs mechanism. In the paper, the authors wrote “*It is interesting that the anomaly appear as a bulk effect in AdS space, in contrast to previously studied examples [4,5] where anomalies arose from boundary terms*”. The aim of this paper is to emphasize the origin for this interesting phenomenon in the gauge/gravity dual.

In fact, in the gauge theory side the answer to this puzzle is very straightforward. The anomaly discussed by Klebanov, Ouyang and Witten [1] and those studied in Refs. [4,5] have completely different physical origin. The former comes from the quantum dynamics of a $\mathcal{N} < 4$ supersymmetric gauge theory and the anomaly coefficient is the beta function of the theory [6,7,9,10], which is usually an internal anomaly [10]; While the later arises from the coupling of a supersymmetric gauge theory with an external gauge field. If the geometry and topology of the external gauge field configuration is non-trivial, then this type of anomaly arises [7,9,10]. The former anomaly is actually a quantum correction to the latter one [11]. This is the reason why there exist two distinct gravitational correspondences to the superconformal anomaly.

Once the field theory origins for these two types of anomaly have been understood, the next step is to reveal the distinct features of their gravitational correspondence in terms of the gauge/gravity dual. However, it is necessary to emphasize the specific feature of the anomaly for space-time symmetry in a supersymmetric field theory before we proceed. As it is well known, the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ space-time supersymmetry is composed of the Poincaré symmetry, supersymmetry and the chiral R -symmetry with generators $M_{\mu\nu}$, P_μ , Q_α ($\alpha = 1, \dots, 4$) and R , respectively. The corresponding three Nöther currents, the energy-momentum tensor $\theta^{\mu\nu}$, the supersymmetry current s^μ and the chiral R -symmetry current j^μ must constitute a supercurrent multiplet [12,13]. Further, in a supersymmetric theory with classical scale symmetry this supercurrent multiplet $(j^\mu, s^\mu, \theta^{\mu\nu})$ is actually a superconformal current multiplet [12,13]. At quantum level, when one member in the supercurrent multiplet suffers from anomaly, the other two members should also become anomalous. These anomalies should constitute an anomaly multiplet since the Poincaré supersymmetry persists [7–10]. Therefore, when we investigate the gravitational dual description to the space-time symmetry anomaly in a supersymmetric theory, we should consider the whole anomaly multiplet. In this paper we consider the superconformal anomaly $(\partial_\mu j^\mu, \gamma^\mu s_\mu, \theta^\mu_\mu)$, which form an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ chiral supermultiplet.

The approaches of revealing the gravitational descriptions to these two types of anomaly in terms of the gauge/gravity correspondence are completely different. The external superconformal anomaly arises from the coupling of a supersymmetric gauge field theory with an external conformal supergravity in four dimensions [7,8]. This anomaly multiplet can be directly calculated with the holographic definition on the AdS/CFT correspondence [3,4]. As it is well known, the original AdS/CFT correspondence conjecture [2] states that the type IIB string theory in the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ background with N units of $R - R$ flux passing through S^5 should describes the same physics as $\mathcal{N} = 4$ $SU(N)$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory. Later, Gubser et al [3] and Witten [4] made this conjecture concrete and proposed a holographic version on this correspondence. This concrete definition has two formulations. One is based on the canonical quantization of a field theory system, which states that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between a quantum state of type II superstring

in the $AdS_{d+1} \times X^{9-d}$ target space-time and a gauge invariant operator of a d -dimensional conformal field theory defined on the boundary of AdS_{d+1} , X^{9-d} being a compact Einstein manifold [4]; The other formulation is established through the path integral quantization on a field theory system. It states that the partition function of type II superstring theory as a functional of the boundary value of the AdS_{d+1} bulk supergravity field should be identical with the generating functional for the correlation function of some gauge invariant operators of a d -dimensional conformal field theory in the external field furnished by the boundary value of the AdS_{d+1} bulk field [4]. At low-energy level, the type II superstring theory is approximated by its low-energy effective theory, the type II supergravity [14]. Subsequently, the partition function of type IIB superstring can be calculated with the saddle point approximation, i.e., it can be evaluated as the exponential of the supergravity action in a field configuration which is determined by the classical equation of motion with initial condition $AdS_{d+1} \times X^{9-d}$. The dual field theory must be in its large- N limit. Further, taking into account the spontaneous compactification [15] on X^{9-d} of type II supergravity [17,18] and assuming that there exists a consistent nonlinear truncation of the massless modes from the massive Kaluza-Klein spectrum [16], we should have a gauged AdS_{d+1} supergravity. The AdS/CFT correspondence between a on-shell gauged AdS_5 supergravity [19] and a four-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theory in an off-shell conformal supergravity background can thus be established. In particular, this off-shell four-dimensional conformal supergravity [20,21] comes from the reduction of five-dimensional gauged supergravity on the boundary of AdS_5 space [22,23]. Consequently, the bulk supersymmetry in gauged AdS_5 supergravity convert into the superconformal symmetry of four-dimensional conformal supergravity [24]. That is, the bulk gauge symmetry decomposes into a vector- and an axial vector gauge symmetry [4]; the bulk diffeomorphism symmetry becomes a diffeomorphism symmetry and a Weyl symmetry [25]; the bulk supersymmetry separates into a Poincaré supersymmetry and a super-Weyl symmetry [22,23,26]. However, the on-shell action of the asymptotically gauged AdS_5 supergravity cannot keep the symmetries in each pair simultaneously [4,5,26]. Usually the vector gauge symmetry, the diffeomorphism symmetry and the Poincaré are required to be satisfied. Therefore we can get the external superconformal anomaly from the on-shell action of gauged AdS_5 supergravity near the AdS_5 boundary. This is usually called the holographic superconformal anomaly [4,5,26,24].

For the internal superconformal anomaly in an $\mathcal{N} < 4$ four-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theory, the case becomes complicated. Since this anomaly stems from the quantum dynamics of a supersymmetric gauge theory itself [7,9,10,13] and has nothing to do with the external conformal supergravity background, we cannot look for its gravitational correspondence using the holographic version on gauge/gravity correspondence. In fact, the existence of this type of superconformal anomaly means that the field theory at quantum level has no conformal symmetry. This is different from the external superconformal anomaly, its existence does not affect the superconformal symmetry of a supersymmetry gauge theory since it arises from the coupling of field theory with the external background field and originates in the non-trivial topology of external field configuration. One typical example is $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in four dimensions. Its energy-momentum tensor, supersymmetry current and $SU_R(4)$ R -symmetry all become anomalous when the theory couples with an $\mathcal{N} = 4$ external conformal supergravity. But the theory itself is still a superconformal theory since its beta function still vanishes. According to the symmetry identification in

the AdS/CFT correspondence [31], the global superconformal symmetry on the field theory has the exactly counterpart with the local supersymmetry in gauged AdS_5 supergravity. That is, the R -symmetry in the gauge field theory corresponds to the gauge symmetry of the AdS_5 gauged supergravity; the space-time conformal symmetry $SO(2, 4)$ is exactly the isometry symmetry of the AdS_5 space; the conformal supersymmetry of the field theory goes to the local supersymmetry of the AdS_5 supergravity. Therefore, we must go beyond the AdS/CFT correspondence to find the gravitational dual description to the internal superconformal anomaly.

How can we carry on to get the dual of the internal superconformal anomaly? Let us recall how the gauge/gravity correspondence is established from the non-perturbative type II superstring theory. It is based on the fact that a Dp -brane has two distinct features [32]. on one hand, in weakly coupled type-II superstring theory, it behaves as a dynamical and geometrical object with open string ending on it. Thus a stack of coincided Dp -branes at low-energy will yield a $p + 1$ -dimensional supersymmetric gauge theory on the world-volume of Dp -branes. We can use various D -branes and solitonic branes as well as other possible geometric objects like orientifold planes to construct various possible brane configurations. In this way any gauge theory in principle can be obtained by such a so-called “brane engineering” [33,34]; On the other hand, a Dp -brane, as string soliton, carries R-R charge and couples with $p + 1$ -rank antisymmetric field originating from the R-R boundary condition. This physical property of a D -brane determines that it provides source to the low-energy effective theory of strongly coupled type-II superstring theory — type-II supergravity. Therefore, it can modify space-time background of string theory and arises as a p -brane solution to type-II supergravity [35,36]. This is the physical reason behind the gauge/gravity duality conjecture.

This suggests that we should resort to a D -brane configuration to look for the gravity dual of the internal superconformal anomaly. Since a supersymmetric gauge theory stems from a D -brane configuration, all its quantum behaviors including the quantum anomaly should be sensible from the corresponding D -brane dynamics [33]. Thus we first find how the superconformal anomaly is manifested in the D -brane configuration, then we use the gravitational perspective of D -branes to observe how it emerge in the gravity side. In this way, we can work out the gravity dual of the internal superconformal anomaly [37].

In Sect. II we review the field theory results on both the external and internal superconformal anomalies of a supersymmetric gauge theory and demonstrate their physical difference. In introducing the external superconformal anomaly, we show how the conservation of the superconformal current multiplet is equivalent to the super-Weyl symmetry of the external conformal supergravity background. So the arising of the external superconformal anomaly is converted into an violation of the super-Weyl symmetry in the external conformal supergravity. This paves the way for the derivation on superconformal anomaly in terms of the AdS/CFT correspondence. In discussing the internal superconformal anomaly, we stress that its anomaly coefficient is proportional to the beta function of the theory. Further, we show that in the quantum effective action it is manifested in the running of gauge coupling and the shift of the strong CP violation angle. To uncover how the γ -trace anomaly of is concealed in the quantum effective action, we write the quantum effective action in the superspace. This facilitate us to find how the superconformal anomaly is reflected in the D -brane configuration. We also give a specific introduction to $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(N + M) \times SU(N)$

supersymmetric gauge theory since its gravity dual description is well studied. Later we shall use this theory to illustrate the dual of internal superconformal anomaly. Sect. III is about the holographic version on AdS/CFT correspondence and its low-energy approximation. We start from Witten's definition [4] on the AdS/CFT correspondence between type II superstring in $AdS_{d+1} \times X^{9-d}$ background and a d -dimensional $SU(N)$ superconformal gauge theory living on the boundary of AdS_{d+1} space. Then using the well-known fact that the low-energy effective theory of type II superstring is the type II supergravity, we get the approximation correspondence between d -dimensional $SU(N)$ superconformal gauge theory at large- N limit and on-shell type II supergravity whose classical solution asymptotically approaches $AdS_{d+1} \times X^{9-d}$. Further, considering the spontaneous compactification on X^{9-d} of type II supergravity and assuming that there exists a consistent truncation of the massive Kaluza-Klein modes [16], we finally establish a correspondence between the gauged AdS_{d+1} supergravity and a d -dimensional superconformal gauge theory in a conformal supergravity background furnished by the AdS_{d+1} boundary data of the bulk supergravity multiplet. To straightforwardly verify this conclusion acquired from string theory level, we start directly from five-dimensional gauged supergravity and check its solution to classical equations of motion which asymptotically approaches the AdS_5 geometry. It is shown that at the leading order of the expansion in the radial coordinate the on-shell fields of gauged $\mathcal{N} = 2, 4$ AdS_5 supergravity indeed constitute the off-shell multiplet for $\mathcal{N} = 1, 2$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions. This reveals the essence that we can get the external superconformal anomaly in four dimensions from gauged AdS_5 supergravity. Based on this conclusion, in Sect. IV we derive the external superconformal anomaly from gauged supergravity in five dimensions. The holographic chiral R -symmetry anomaly comes from the Chern-Simons five-form term in gauged AdS_5 supergravity; The holographic Weyl symmetry anomaly lies in the IR divergence of on-shell action of gauged AdS_5 supergravity near the AdS_5 boundary due to the infinite volume of AdS_5 space. This requires a so-called holographic renormalization procedure to implement and thus leads to the holographic Weyl anomaly; Finally the arising of super-Weyl anomaly is revealed through the supersymmetry variation of gauged AdS_5 supergravity. As a supersymmetric field theory, its variation under supersymmetric transformation should be a total derivative. When we take this total derivative to the AdS_5 boundary and consider the on-shell fields, it is found that these total derivatives cannot preserve the four-dimensional supersymmetry and super-Weyl symmetry simultaneously. In this way the super-Weyl anomaly is uncovered. From Sect. V we turn to the search for the dual description to internal superconformal anomaly. First, a general review is given on how a D -brane configuration can on one hand yield a supersymmetric gauge theory in a weakly coupled type II superstring theory and on the other hand behave as a classical solution to type II supergravity in a strongly coupled type II superstring. We emphatically point out the D -brane configuration comprised of N $D3$ -branes and M fractional $D3$ -branes in the target space-time $M^4 \times \mathcal{C}^6$, here $\mathcal{C}^6$ is the six-dimensional conifold with the base $T^{1,1} = [SU(2) \times SU(2)]/U(1)$. This D -brane configuration in the field theory side gives the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ supersymmetric gauge theory with four matter fields in the bi-fundamental representation $(N+M, \overline{N})$ and $(\overline{N+M}, N)$, respectively, of gauge groups, and in the gravity side produces the celebrated Klebanov–Strassler solution to type IIB supergravity. In Sect. VI, we consider the Dirac-Born-Infeld action and the Wess-Zumino term of describing the low-energy dynamics of D -branes and show that the internal super-

conformal anomaly originates from the physical effects of fractional D -branes in the brane configuration. Then we use the feature of D -brane in strongly coupled type II superstring theory to argue that these fractional branes deform the three-brane solution to type IIB supergravity whose near horizon limit is $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ and convert this solution into the K-S solution. Further, by comparing the symmetries reflected in $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ and K-S solution background geometries, we find how space-time supersymmetries symmetry decrease due to fractional branes. Sect. VII shows how the dual of internal superconformal anomaly can be considered as a spontaneous breaking of local supersymmetry and the consequent super-Higgs mechanism in gauged asymptotical AdS_5 supergravity. We choose the K-S solution as a classical vacuum configuration and observe the dynamical behavior of type IIB supergravity. We realize that the spontaneous compactification of type IIB supergravity on the deformed $T^{1,1}$ should occur and the resultant theory should be certain gauged supergravity in five dimensions. In contrast to the case of type IIB supergravity in the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ space-time background, which gives rise to $N = 2$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity coupled with $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory and some Betti multiplets, we find that this gauged five-dimensional supergravity should be the gauged AdS_5 supergravity but with spontaneous breaking of local $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry to $\mathcal{N} = 1$. We further exhibit the consequent super-Higgs mechanism through which the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ graviton multiplet acquires mass. Finally Sect. VIII is a summary and emphasis on the significance of distinguishing the gravitational correspondences of these two types of superconformal anomalies.

II. TWO TYPES SUPERCONFORMAL ANOMALIES OF SUPERSYMMETRIC GAUGE THEORY

A. Supercurrent and Superconformal Anomaly

In a supersymmetric field theory, the Poincaré supersymmetry algebra makes the energy-momentum tensor $\theta^{\mu\nu}$, supersymmetry current s^μ and chiral R-current j^μ constitute a supermultiplet¹. Further, if the theory contains no parameter with mass dimension, these currents at classical level are not only conserved,

$$\partial_\mu \theta^{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu s^\mu = \partial_\mu j^\mu = 0, \quad (1)$$

but also satisfy further algebraic relations,

$$\theta^\mu{}_\mu = \gamma_\mu s^\mu = 0. \quad (2)$$

We can use these relations to construct three more conserved currents,

$$\begin{aligned} d^\mu &\equiv x_\nu \theta^{\nu\mu}, \quad k_{\mu\nu} \equiv 2x_\nu x^\rho \theta_{\rho\mu} - x^2 \theta_{\mu\nu}, \quad l_\mu \equiv i x^\nu \gamma_\nu s_\mu; \\ \partial_\mu d^\mu &= \partial_\mu k^{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu l^\mu = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

¹Here and in the following, the possible spinorial and chiral R -symmetry group indices in s^μ and j^μ are suppressed in the supersymmetry currents in the supercurrent.

These three new conserved currents gives rise to the generators for dilatation, conformal boosts and special supersymmetry, respectively. Consequently, the Poincaré supersymmetry is promoted to the superconformal symmetry.

However, the superconformal symmetry at quantum level may become anomalous. In the case that all of them, the trace θ^μ_μ of energy-momentum tensor, the γ -trace $\gamma^\mu j_\mu$ of supersymmetry current and the divergence $\partial_\mu j^\mu$ of chiral R -current receive contribution from quantum effects,

$$(\partial_\mu j^\mu, \gamma^\mu s_\mu, \theta^\mu_\mu) \quad (4)$$

shall form a (on-shell) chiral supermultiplet with the $\partial_\mu j^\mu$ playing the role of the lowest componentt [12]².

There are usually two possible sources for above chiral supermultiplet anomaly. One is that the supersymmetric gauge theory couples with an external conformal supergravity background composed of the gravitational supermultiplet $(g_{\mu\nu}, \psi_\mu, A_\mu)$. Note that for a supersymmetric gauge theory in four-dimensional Minkowski space-time, the space-time symmetries which include the Poincaré symmetry, supersymmetry and chiral R -symmetry are all global ones and there are no gauge fields within the theory itself to couple with the supercurrent multiplet $(\theta_{\mu\nu}, s_\mu, j_\mu)$. Once we consider the theory in a curved space-time background, the superconformal anomaly (4) will arise if the field configuration of the external conformal supergravity multiplet $(g_{\mu\nu}, \psi_\mu, A_\mu)$ has non-trivial topology.

The other type of superconformal anomaly supermultiplet originates from the dynamics of a less supersymmetric ($\mathcal{N} < 4$) gauge theory itself and has nothing to do with external conformal supergravity background. Eq.(4) in this case is actually a scale anomaly supermultiplet. In an $\mathcal{N} < 4$ supersymmetric gauge theory, an energy scale is generated dynamically due to the renormalization effect. Consequently, the scale anomaly and the corresponding multiplet required by supersymmetry must arise. To distinguish this scale anomaly supermutiplet with the one originating from external supergravity fields, we call this anomaly chiral supermultiplet as the internal superconformal anomaly, while the former one as external superconformal anomaly. It should be emphasized that the internal anomaly has distinct features with the external one. The coefficient of internal superconformal anomaly depends on the beta function of the theory. For a superconformal quantum gauge theory such as $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory, its beta function vanishes and there is no internal superconformal anomaly, but the external one persists.

In the following we list the external and internal superconformal anomalies in several typical supersymmetric gauge theories.

²In case that $\theta^\mu_\mu \neq 0$, $\gamma^\mu j_\mu \neq 0$, whereas the chiral R -currents keeps conserved, $\partial_\mu j^{(5)\mu} = 0$, there will arise a linear anomaly multiplet $(\theta^\mu_\mu, \gamma^\mu s_\mu, t_{\mu\nu})$. In this multiplet, the antisymmetric field $t_{\mu\nu}$ satisfies $\partial^\nu t_{\nu\mu} = 0$. It appears in both multiplets of currents and anolies. But $t_{\mu\nu}$ does not yield a conservative charge for supersymmetry algebra. One can get other types of anomaly multiplets by considering other possibilities.

B. Superconformal Anomaly and Current Supermultiplet in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory

A four-dimensional supersymmetric $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theory consists of a vector field V_μ , a Majorana spinor λ and an auxiliary D . All of them are in the adjoint representation of $SU(N)$. The classical Lagrangian density reads

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{\mu\nu a} + \frac{1}{2}i\bar{\lambda}^a \gamma^\mu (\nabla_\mu \lambda)^a + \frac{1}{2}(D^a)^2. \quad (5)$$

The current multiplet $(j_\mu, s_\mu, \theta_{\mu\nu})$ can be easily derived from the the chiral $U_R(1)$ symmetry, supersymmetry and Poincaré symmetry with the Nöther theorem. The internal anomaly chiral multiplet was obtained long time ago with an explicit perturbative calculation [53,7,9],

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu j^\mu &= 2\frac{\beta(g)}{g} \left[\frac{1}{12}G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}^{a\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{6}\partial^\mu \left(\bar{\lambda}^a \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \lambda^a \right) \right], \\ \gamma^\mu s_\mu &= 2\frac{\beta(g)}{g} \left(-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu}^a + \gamma_5 D^a \right) \lambda^a, \\ \theta_\mu^\mu &= 2\frac{\beta(g)}{g} \left[-\frac{1}{4}G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{\mu\nu a} + \frac{1}{2}i\bar{\lambda}^a \gamma^\mu (\nabla_\mu \lambda)^a + \frac{1}{2}(D^a)^2 \right], \\ P &= -\beta(g)\bar{\lambda}^a \lambda^a, \quad Q = -\beta(g)\bar{\lambda}^a \gamma_5 \lambda^a. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

It is obvious that the internal superconformal anomaly coefficient is proportional to the beta function of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory. The origins of scale anomaly θ_μ^μ and chiral anomaly are the same as in a usual field theory: The UV divergence requires the process of performing renormalization to make the theory well defined and hence need to introduces a dynamical generated energy scale, the scale anomaly thus arises; The acquirement of chiral $U_R(1)$ anomaly $\partial_\mu j^\mu$ is identical to the derivation on axial $U_A(1)$ anomaly in QCD. This $U_R(1)$ symmetry is not compatible with the global vector $U_V(1)$ rotational symmetry among gauginos at quantum level. When the vector $U_V(1)$ symmetry is preserved, the $U_R(1)$ symmetry becomes anomalous. The production of γ trace anomaly $\gamma^\mu s_\mu$ lies in the incompatibility of the conservation of supersymmetry current and non-vanishing γ -trace of supercurrent s_μ at quantum level. Since the supersymmetry current should keep conserved, the γ -trace anomaly thus emerges.

In the following we turn to the external superconformal anomaly multiplet. As stated above, the currents must couple with an external supergravity multiplet in the following form,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ext}} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left(\theta^{\mu\nu} g_{\mu\nu} + B_\mu j^\mu + \bar{\psi}_\mu s^\mu \right). \quad (7)$$

The above Lagrangian density for a supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in an supergravity background means that the covariant conservations of energy-momentum tensor, supersymmetry current and chiral R -symmetry current, $\nabla_\mu \theta^{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu s^\mu = 0$, are equivalent to the diffeomorphism transformation invariance, local supersymmetry and gauge symmetry of the external supergravity, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta g_{\mu\nu}(x) &= \nabla_\mu \xi_\nu(x) + \nabla_\nu \xi_\mu(x), \\
\delta \psi_\mu(x) &= \nabla_\mu \chi(x), \\
\delta B_\mu(x) &= \nabla_\mu \Lambda(x).
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Further, the vanishing of both γ -trace of supercurrent and trace of energy-momentum tensor, $\gamma^\mu s_\mu = \theta^\mu_\mu = 0$, implies the Weyl- and super-Weyl symmetries in the external supergravity,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta g_{\mu\nu} &= g_{\mu\nu} \sigma(x), \\
\delta \psi_\mu &= \gamma_\mu \eta(x),
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

These symmetries show that the external supergravity must be $\mathcal{N} = 1$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions [20]. Later we will see explicitly that in the context of *AdS/CFT* correspondence or generally gauge/gravity dual, this $\mathcal{N} = 1$ external conformal supergravity in four dimensions comes from the *AdS*₅ boundary value of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gauged *AdS*₅ supergravity multiplet and the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ local superconformal symmetry in this conformal supergravity originates from the *AdS*₅ boundary reduction of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ bulk supergravity. The external superconformal anomaly in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory will be reflected in the explicit violations of the bulk symmetries of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gauged *AdS*₅ supergravity on the boundary of *AdS*₅ space.

With no consideration the quantum correction from the dynamics of supersymmetric gauge theory, the external anomaly is exhausted at one-loop level. The external superconformal anomaly multiplet for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ pure supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory is the following [9],

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_\mu j^\mu &= \frac{N^2 - 1}{16\pi^2} \left(K_{\mu\nu} \widetilde{K}^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{24} \widetilde{R}_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} R^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \right) \\
\gamma^\mu s_\mu &= \frac{N^2 - 1}{16\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{16} R^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \sigma_{\lambda\rho} + \frac{1}{16} K^{\mu\nu} \right) (\overline{\nabla}_\mu \psi_\nu - \overline{\nabla}_\nu \psi_\mu), \\
\theta^\mu_\mu &= \frac{N^2 - 1}{16\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{8} C_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} C^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} - \frac{3}{16} \widetilde{R}_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \widetilde{R}^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} + \frac{1}{3} K^{\mu\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

In above equation, $K_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu$ is the field strength of external $U_R(1)$ vector field B_μ ; $R_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}$ and $C_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}$ are Riemannian and Weyl tensors corresponding to gravitational background $g_{\mu\nu}$; $\overline{\nabla}_\mu$ is the covariant derivative with respect to both gravitational and $U_R(1)$ fields. The common factor $N^2 - 1$ in the anomaly coefficients is due to the fact that the gaugino is in the adjoint representation of $SU(N)$ gauge group.

In contrast to the internal superconformal anomaly, the external one listed in (10) comes only from one-loop contribution of the theory and the anomaly coefficient is proportional to the number of gauge particles in supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory [55]. When we consider quantum dynamics of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory, the anomaly coefficient receives quantum correction [56]. In particular, the internal superconformal anomaly arises as a correction to the external one.

Let us analyze the manifestation of internal superconformal anomaly (6) in the quantum effective action of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory. First, we re-scale the fields $(A_\mu, \lambda, D) \rightarrow (A_\mu/g, \lambda/g, D/g)$ and consider the strong CP violation term. Consequently, the classical action of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theory can be re-written as the following,

$$S_{\text{cl}} = \frac{1}{g^2} \int d^4x \left[-\frac{1}{4} G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{\mu\nu a} + \frac{1}{2} i \bar{\lambda}^a \gamma^\mu (\nabla_\mu \lambda)^a + \frac{1}{2} (D^a)^2 \right] + \frac{\theta^{(\text{CP})}}{32\pi^2} \int d^4x G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu a}. \quad (11)$$

The local part of the gauge invariant quantum effective action takes the form,

$$\Gamma_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} \int d^4x \left[-\frac{1}{4} G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{\mu\nu a} + \frac{1}{2} i \bar{\lambda}^a \gamma^\mu (\nabla_\mu \lambda)^a + \frac{1}{2} (D^a)^2 \right] + \frac{\theta_{\text{eff}}^{(\text{CP})}}{32\pi^2} \int d^4x G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu a}, \quad (12)$$

where all the fields are renormalized quantities. The scale- and chiral anomalies are reflected in the running of gauge coupling and the shift of θ -angle due to the non-vanishing $\beta(g)$ [57],

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}^2(q^2)} &= \frac{1}{g^2(q_0^2)} + \frac{3N}{8\pi^2} \ln \frac{q_0}{q} \equiv \frac{3N}{8\pi^2} \ln \frac{q}{\Lambda}, \\ \theta_{\text{eff}}^{(\text{CP})} &= \theta^{(\text{CP})} + 3N. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

To recognize the γ -trace anomaly of supersymmetry current in above gauge invariant quantum effective action, we must resort to the superfield form of quantum effective action (12) expressed in the superspace,

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{32\pi} \int d^2\theta \text{Im} [\tau \text{Tr} (W^\alpha W_\alpha)] + \text{h.c.}. \quad (14)$$

In above equation, the parameter τ is a complex combination of gauge coupling and CP-violated θ -angle,

$$\tau = \frac{\theta^{(\text{CP})}}{2\pi} + i \frac{4\pi}{g^2}. \quad (15)$$

W_α is the field strength corresponding to vector superfield V ,

$$W_\alpha = \frac{1}{g} \bar{D}^2 \left[e^{-gV} (D_\alpha e^{gV}) \right]. \quad (16)$$

In the Wess-Zumino gauge,

$$\begin{aligned} V &= -\theta \sigma^\mu \bar{\theta} A_\mu + i \bar{\theta}^2 \theta \lambda - i \theta^2 \bar{\theta} \bar{\lambda} - \frac{1}{2} \theta^2 \bar{\theta}^2 D, \\ W_\alpha &= \bar{D}^2 \left(D_\alpha V - \frac{g}{2} [V, D_\alpha V] \right) \\ &= \lambda_\alpha - \frac{i}{2} (\sigma^{\mu\nu})_{\alpha\beta} \theta^\beta F_{\mu\nu} + i \theta_\alpha D - i \theta^2 (\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \nabla \bar{\lambda}^{\dot{\alpha}}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We assume that τ is the lowest component of certain constant chiral superfield,

$$\Sigma \equiv \tau + \theta \chi + \theta^2 d \quad (18)$$

Further, we define that classically $\chi_{\text{cl}} = d_{\text{cl}} = 0$ and only at quantum level χ and d get non-vanishing expectation values,

$$\Sigma_{\text{eff}} \equiv \tau_{\text{eff}} + \theta \chi_{\text{eff}} + \theta^2 d_{\text{eff}}, \quad (19)$$

where $\theta_{\text{eff}}^{(\text{CP})}$ and g_{eff}^2 are listed in (13). In the Wess-Zumino gauge, the generalized quantum effective action in superspace takes the form,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\text{eff}} &= \frac{1}{32\pi} \int d^2\theta \text{Im} [\Sigma_{\text{eff}} \text{Tr} (W^\alpha W_\alpha)] + \text{h.c.} \\ &= \frac{1}{32\pi} \int d^2\theta \text{Im} \left\{ \left(\frac{\theta_{\text{eff}}^{(\text{CP})}}{2\pi} + \frac{4i\pi}{g_{\text{eff}}^2} + \theta\chi_{\text{eff}} + \theta^2 d_{\text{eff}} \right) [\lambda\lambda + i\theta (2\lambda D + \sigma^{\mu\nu} \lambda G_{\mu\nu}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \theta^2 \left(-\frac{1}{2} G_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} + \frac{i}{2} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu} - 2i\lambda\sigma^\mu \nabla_\mu \bar{\lambda} - D^2 \right) \right] \right\} + \text{h.c.}.\end{aligned}\quad (20)$$

A comparison between Eq. (20) and the superconformal anomaly equation (6) reveals the presence of fermionic anomaly in the quantum effective action. The γ -trace anomaly of supersymmetry current due to the non-vanishing β -function is reflected in the shift of the superpartner parameter χ , exactly like trace- and chiral anomalies are represented by the shifts of the gauge couplings and the θ -angle. This is the advantage of promoting τ parameter to a chiral superfield. Of course, this should be a natural conclusion since the superconformal anomaly constitutes a supermultiplet. However, later we will see that from the viewpoint of brane dynamics, the running of gauge coupling and the shift of θ angle originate from fractional branes and further get down to the Goldstone fields. Therefore, introducing an artificial superpartner for the gauge coupling and θ -angle is very helpful for us to identify the Goldstone supermultiplet on supergravity side and find the super-Higgs mechanism due to the internal superconformal anomaly.

C. Supercurrent in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Supersymmetric $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills Theory

The field content of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ pure supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory consists of a vector field V_μ , a complex scalar $\phi \equiv (A + iB)/2$ and a $SU_I(2)$ symplectic Majorana spinor $\lambda^i = \epsilon^{ij} i\gamma_5 C \bar{\lambda}_j^T$,

$$\lambda^i = \begin{pmatrix} -i\epsilon^{ij} \lambda_{\alpha j} \\ \bar{\lambda}^{\dot{\alpha} i} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{\lambda}_i = (\lambda_i^\alpha, i\epsilon_{ij} \bar{\lambda}_{\dot{\alpha}}^j)$$

$i, j = 1, 2$ being the $SU_I(2)$ indices and C being the charge conjugation matrix. All of these fields are in the adjoint representation of gauge group $SU(N)$. The Lagrangian density of this theory reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{a\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} i \bar{\lambda}_i^a \gamma^\mu D_\mu \lambda^{ai} + \frac{1}{2} (D_\mu A)^a (D^\mu A)^a + \frac{1}{2} (D_\mu B)^a (D^\mu B)^a \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{2} g f^{abc} \bar{\lambda}_i^a (A^b + i\gamma_5 B^b) \lambda^{ci} + \frac{1}{2} ([A, B]^a)^2.\end{aligned}\quad (21)$$

Note that now the R -symmetry is $U_R(2) = SU_I(2) \times U_R(1)$. The $SU_I(2)$ transformation rotates only the λ doublet,

$$\delta \lambda^i = i\theta^A (t^A)^i_j \lambda^j, \quad \delta \bar{\lambda}_i = -i\bar{\lambda}_j (t^A)^j_i \theta^A, \quad (22)$$

while the chiral $U_R(1)$ acts both of the spinor and the complex scalar fields,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\phi(x) &= -2i\alpha\phi(x), & \delta\phi^\star &= 2i\alpha\phi^\star, \\ \delta\lambda^i(x) &= i\alpha\gamma_5\lambda^i(x), & \delta\bar{\lambda}_i &= i\alpha\bar{\lambda}_i\gamma_5.\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

Let us write down the current supermultiplet for $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory, which was actually derived long-time ago in the form of Weyl spinor [58,59]. First, the improved energy-momentum tensor reads [58,59],

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{\mu\nu} &= -F_{\mu\lambda}^a F_\nu^{a\lambda} + \frac{1}{4}\eta_{\mu\nu} F_{\lambda\rho}^a F^{a\lambda\rho} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}i \left[\bar{\lambda}_i^a (\gamma_\mu D_\nu + \gamma_\nu D_\mu) \lambda^{ia} - (D_\mu \bar{\lambda}_i^a \gamma_\nu + D_\nu \bar{\lambda}_i^a \gamma_\mu) \lambda^{ai} \right] - \frac{1}{4}i\eta_{\mu\nu} \left(\bar{\lambda}_i^a \gamma^\lambda \nabla_\lambda^{ai} - \nabla_\lambda \bar{\lambda}_i^a \gamma^\lambda \lambda^{ai} \right) \\ &+ \frac{2}{3} (D_\mu A^a D_\nu A^a + D_\mu B^a D_\nu B^a) - \frac{1}{6}\eta_{\mu\nu} (D_\lambda A^a D^\lambda A^a + D_\lambda B^a D^\lambda B^a) \\ &- \frac{1}{3} (A^a D_\mu D_\nu A^a + B^a D_\mu D_\nu B^a) + \frac{1}{12}\eta_{\mu\nu} (A^a D_\lambda D^\lambda A^a + B^a D_\lambda D^\lambda B^a).\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

The improved supersymmetry current $s_{\mu\alpha}^i$ can be obtained from $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry transformation but with the modification of adding some total derivative terms,

$$\begin{aligned}s_\mu^i &= -\sigma_{\nu\rho}\gamma_\mu\lambda^{ia}F^{\nu\rho} + 2i(A^a - i\gamma_5 B^a)D_\mu\lambda^{ia} \\ &+ \frac{i}{2}(A^a - i\gamma_5 B^a)\gamma_\mu\gamma^\nu D_\nu\lambda^{ai} - \frac{2}{3}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu \left[(A^a + i\gamma_5 B^a)\lambda^{ia} \right],\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

which is a $SU(2)_I$ doublet. Both the energy-momentum tensor and supersymmetry current satisfy the superconformal condition listed in Eq. (2).

The $SU_I(2)$ current j_μ^A and chiral $U_R(1)$ current j_μ , can be read out from rotations (22) and (23), respectively,

$$\begin{aligned}j_\mu^A &= \frac{1}{2}\bar{\lambda}_i^a \gamma_\mu (t^A)^i_j \lambda^{aj}, \quad A = 1, 2, 3 \\ j_\mu &= \frac{1}{2}\bar{\lambda}_i^a \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \lambda^{ia} + 2i[\phi^{\star a} (D_\mu \phi)^a - (D_\mu \phi^\star)^a \phi^a] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\bar{\lambda}_i^a \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \lambda^{ia} + A^a D_\mu B^a - B^a D_\mu A^a.\end{aligned}\tag{26}$$

So we have following 24 + 24-component current supermultiplet,

$$(\theta_{\mu\nu}, s_{\mu\alpha}^i, j_\mu^A, j_\mu, t_{\mu\nu}, \varsigma^i, D),\tag{27}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\varsigma^i &= \frac{i}{2} (A^a + i\gamma_5 B^a) \lambda^{ia}, \\ t_{\mu\nu} &= \frac{1}{2}\bar{\lambda}_i^a \sigma_{\mu\nu} \lambda^{ai} + i\phi^a F_{\mu\nu}^{a-}, \quad F_{\mu\nu}^- = \frac{1}{2} (F_{\mu\nu} - \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}), \\ D &= \phi^{a\star} \phi^a = \frac{1}{4} (A^{a2} + B^{a2}).\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

Similar to $\mathcal{N} = 1$ case, one can discuss the superconformal anomaly of above current supermultiplet. It is well known that the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory has non-vanishing beta function at only one-loop [62], so the internal superconformal anomaly arises only at the first order of the perturbative expansion. The trace θ^μ_μ of the energy-momentum tensor $\theta_{\mu\nu}$, the γ -trace of supersymmetry current s^i_μ and the divergence of $U(1)_R$ current j^μ form an anomaly supermultiplet dominated by $N = 2$ Poincaré supersymmetry. The structure of this anomaly is similar to the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills case [61]. It should be mentioned that $SU(2)_R$ is non-anomalous since it is a vector-like current and is responsible for the global $SU(2)_R$ rotation symmetry of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Poincaré supersymmetry after the superconformal symmetry breaks down.

The external superconformal anomaly multiplet arises if the external $\mathcal{N} = 2$ conformal supergravity fields $(g_{\mu\nu}, \psi_\mu^i, V_\mu^A, B_\mu, B_{\mu\nu}, X, \chi^i)$ couple with the off-shell supercurrent (27). Like the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ case, the classical superconformal symmetry of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory correspond to the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ superconformal transformation invariance of the external conformal supergravity. The structure of this $\mathcal{N} = 2$ external superconformal anomaly is similar to Eq. (10) of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ case.

D. Current Supermultiplet in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory

$\mathcal{N} = 4$ $SU(N)$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in four dimensions is a non-trivial superconformal quantum gauge theory since its β -function vanishes identically [63]. Its R-symmetry is the $SU_R(4)$ rather than $U(4)$. The field content consists of $SU(N)$ gauge fields A_μ , a Majorana spinor λ_i in the fundamental representation of $SU_R(4)$, and complex scalar fields $\phi_{ij} \equiv 1/2(A_{ij} + iB_{ij})$ in the six-dimensional representation of $SU_R(4)$ and subject to an $SU_R(4)$ covariant reality constraint $(\phi_{ij})^* = 1/2\epsilon^{ijkl}\phi_{kl} \equiv \phi^{ij}$. To manifest the $SU_R(4)$ symmetry in the classical action, it is necessary not to insist on the symplectic-Majorana feature of λ_i . Instead we choose the chiral component $\lambda_{\alpha i}$ and define $\bar{\lambda}^i_{\dot{\alpha}} \equiv (\lambda_{\alpha i})^\dagger$ so that $\lambda_{\alpha i}$ and $\bar{\lambda}^i_{\dot{\alpha}}$ constitute a four-component Dirac spinor λ_i . Correspondingly, The classical Lagrangian density of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory is [63]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{a\mu\nu} + i\bar{\lambda}^{ai}\gamma^\mu D_\mu \lambda_i^a + \frac{1}{2}D_\mu \phi^{ija} D^\mu \phi_{ij}^a \\ & + \frac{1}{2}f^{abc} [\bar{\lambda}^{ia}(1+\gamma_5)\lambda_j^b \phi_{ij}^c - \bar{\lambda}_i^a(1-\gamma_5)\lambda_j^b \phi^{cij}] + \frac{1}{4}[\phi_{ij}, \phi_{kl}][\phi^{ij}, \phi^{kl}] \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The members of current multiplet contains not only energy-momentum tensor $\theta_{\mu\nu}$, supersymmetry current s^i_μ and chiral $SU_R(4)$ current j^i_μ [60],

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{\mu\nu} = & \frac{1}{4}\eta_{\mu\nu}F_{\lambda\rho}^a F^{a\lambda\rho} - F_{\mu\lambda}^a F_{\nu}^{a\lambda} \\ & + \frac{1}{2}i[\bar{\lambda}^{ia}(\gamma_\mu D_\nu + \gamma_\nu D_\mu)\lambda_i^a - (D_\mu \bar{\lambda}^{ia}\gamma_\nu + D_\nu \bar{\lambda}^{ia}\gamma_\mu)\lambda_i^a] - \frac{1}{4}\eta_{\mu\nu}(\bar{\lambda}^{ia}\gamma_\rho D_\mu - D_\lambda \bar{\lambda}^{ia}\gamma^\rho)\lambda_i^a \\ & - \eta_{\mu\nu}D_\rho \phi^{aij} D_\rho \phi_{ij}^a + 2D_\mu \phi^{aij} D_\nu \phi_{ij}^a - \frac{1}{3}(\partial^2 \eta_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\mu \partial_\nu)(\phi^{ij}\phi_{ij}), \\ s_{\mu i} = & -\frac{1}{2}\sigma^{\nu\rho}F_{\nu\rho}^a \gamma_\mu (1+\gamma_5)\lambda_i^a \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +i(1-\gamma_5)\left(\phi_{ij}^a D_\mu \lambda^{aj} - D_\mu \phi_{ij}^a \lambda^{aj}\right) + \frac{2}{3}i(1-\gamma_5)\sigma_{\mu\nu}\partial^\nu\left(\phi_{ij}^a \lambda^{aj}\right), \\
j_\mu^i{}^j = j_\mu^A\left(t^A\right)^i{}_j &= \phi^{aik} D_\mu \phi_{kj}^a - \left(D_\mu \phi^{aik}\right)\phi_{kj} \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\lambda}^{ai}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)\lambda_j^a - \frac{1}{8}\delta^i{}_j\bar{\lambda}^{ak}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)\lambda_k^a,
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

but also the following compensating quantities,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C} &= F_{\mu\nu}^{a-} F^{\mu\nu a-}, \quad F_{\mu\nu}^{a\pm} = \frac{1}{2}\left(F_{\mu\nu}^a \pm \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}F^{a\lambda\rho}\right), \\
\chi_i &= \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{\mu\nu}(1-\gamma_5)\lambda_i^{Ca}F^{a\mu\nu}, \\
t_{ij} &= \frac{1}{2}\bar{\lambda}_i^a(1-\gamma_5)\lambda_j^a, \\
t_{\mu\nu}^{ij} &= \frac{1}{2}\bar{\lambda}^{ai}(1-\gamma_5)\sigma_{\mu\nu}\lambda^{aj} + 2i\phi^{aij}F_{\mu\nu}^{a-}, \\
\tau_k^{ij} &= \frac{1}{4}(1-\gamma_5)\epsilon^{ijmn}(\phi_{mn}^a\lambda_k^a + \phi_{kn}^a\lambda_m^a), \\
\mathcal{D}_{kl}^{ij} &= \phi^{aij}\phi_{kl}^a - \frac{1}{12}\left(\delta_k^i\delta_l^j - \delta_l^i\delta_k^j\right)\phi_{mn}^a\phi^{amn},
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where $A = 1, \dots, 15$ denote $SU_R(4)$ group generators and $i, j, k, m, n = 1, \dots, 4$ are its fundamental representation indices.

$\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory has no internal superconformal anomaly since it has the vanishing beta function. However, the external superconformal anomaly can arise if above currents couple with external $N = 4$ conformal supergravity fields $(g_{\mu\nu}, \psi_\mu, A_{\mu i}^j, \varphi, \psi_i, E^{ij}, B_{\mu\nu}^{ij}, \psi_{ij}^k, D_{ij}^{kl})$. The structure of the external superconformal anomaly is similar to $\mathcal{N} = 1$ case.

E. Supercurrent and Internal Superconformal Anomaly in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Supersymmetric $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ Gauge Theory with Two Flavors in Bifundamental Representations

The dual description for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ gauge theory with two flavors in the representations $(N+M, \bar{N})$ and $(\bar{N}+\bar{M}, N)$ on string theory side is the type IIB superstring in the geometric background furnished by Klebanov-Strassler solution [49]. The classical action of this supersymmetric gauge theory in superspace takes the following form [37],

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \int d^4x \left\{ \frac{1}{32\pi} \int d^2\theta \sum_{i=1}^2 \text{Im} \left[\tau_{(i)} \text{Tr} \left(W^{(i)\alpha} W_\alpha^{(i)} \right) \right] + \text{h.c.} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta} \sum_{j=1}^2 \left(\bar{A}^j e^{[g_1 V^{(1)}(N+M) + g_2 V_2(\bar{N})]} A_j + \bar{B}_j e^{[g_1 V^{(1)}(\bar{N}+\bar{M}) + g_2 V_2(N)]} B^j \right) \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where the two flavors A_j and B^j are chiral superfields in the bifundamental representations $(N+M, \bar{N})$ and $(\bar{N}+\bar{M}, N)$, respectively. This model also admits a quartic superpotential,

$W = \lambda \epsilon^{ik} \epsilon^{jl} \text{Tr} (A_i B_j A_k B_l)$, which normalizes the R-charge of chiral superfields A_i , B^j to be 1/2. This model is a vector supersymmetric gauge theory and A_i and B^j can be considered as quark- and anti-quark chiral superfields, respectively. The two-component form of above action in the Wess-Zumino gauge is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} = & \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{g_{(i)}^2} \left[-\frac{1}{4} G^{(i)a_i \mu \nu} G_{\mu \nu}^{(i)a_i} + i \lambda^{(i)a_i} \sigma^\mu \left(\nabla_\mu \bar{\lambda}^{(i)} \right)^{a_i} + \frac{1}{2} D^{(i)a_i} D^{(i)a_i} \right] + \frac{\theta^{(\text{CP})}_{(i)}}{32\pi^2} G^{(i)a_i \mu \nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu \nu}^{(i)a_i} \\
& + (D^\mu \phi_A)^{\dagger j} D_\mu \phi_{Aj} + \widetilde{D}^\mu \phi_B^j (\widetilde{D}_\mu \phi_B)^{\dagger}_j + i \bar{\psi}_A^j \bar{\sigma}^\mu D_\mu \psi_{Aj} + i \psi_B^j \sigma^\mu \widetilde{D}_\mu \bar{\psi}_{Bj} \\
& + \sqrt{2} i \sum_{i=1}^2 (-1)^{i+1} g_{(i)} \left[\phi_A^{\dagger j} T^{a_i} \lambda_{(i)}^{a_i} \psi_{Aj} - \bar{\lambda}_{(i)}^{a_i} \bar{\psi}_A^j T^{a_i} \phi_{Aj} - \psi_B^j \lambda_{(i)}^{a_i} T^{a_i} \phi_{Bj}^\dagger + \phi_B^j T^{a_i} \bar{\psi}_{Bj} \bar{\lambda}_{(i)}^{a_i} \right] \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^2 g_{(i)} (-1)^{i+1} D_{(i)}^{a_i} \left[\phi_A^{\dagger j} T^{a_i} \phi_{Aj} - \phi_B^j T^{a_i} \phi_{Bj}^\dagger \right] \\
& + F_A^{\dagger j} F_{Aj} + F_B^j F_{Bj}^\dagger + \left[\left(F_{Aj} \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi_{Aj}} + F_B^j \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi_B^j} \right) \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi_{Ai} \partial \phi_{Aj}} \psi_{Ai} \psi_{Aj} + \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi_B^i \partial \phi_B^j} \psi_B^i \psi_B^j + 2 \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi_{Ai} \partial \phi_B^j} \psi_{Ai} \psi_B^j \right) + \text{h.c.} \right], \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

where ∇_μ , D_μ and $\widetilde{D}_\mu$ are gauge covariant derivatives in adjoint-, fundamental and anti-fundamental representations.

The theory has global flavor symmetry $SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2) \times U_B(1) \times U_A(1)$ at classical level and the $U_A(1)$ symmetry becomes anomalous at quantum level. In addition, the theory has R-symmetry chiral $U_R(1)$. It is this chiral $U_R(1)$ symmetry anomaly that enters the internal superconformal anomaly multiplet.

The supercurrent multiplet (in four-component form) is similar to those in pure supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory and the difference is the involvement of the matter fields,

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_{\mu\nu} = & \sum_{i=1}^2 \left\{ -G_{\mu\rho}^{(i)a_i} G_{\nu}^{(i)a_i\rho} + \frac{1}{2} i \left[\bar{\lambda}^{a_i} (\gamma_\mu \nabla_\nu + \gamma_\nu \nabla_\mu) \lambda^{a_i} - (\nabla_\mu \bar{\lambda}^{a_i} \gamma_\nu + \nabla_\nu \bar{\lambda}^{a_i} \gamma_\mu) \lambda^{a_i} \right] \right. \\
& + \frac{1}{4} g_{\mu\nu} G_{\lambda\rho}^{(i)a_i} G^{(i)a_i\lambda\rho} - \frac{1}{4} i g_{\mu\nu} \left[\bar{\lambda}^{a_i} \gamma^\rho (\nabla_\rho \lambda^{a_i}) - (\nabla_\rho \bar{\lambda}^{a_i}) \gamma^\rho \lambda^{a_i} \right] \Big\} \\
& + \left[(D_\mu \phi_A)^{\dagger j} D_\nu \phi_{Aj} + (D_\nu \phi_A)^{\dagger j} D_\mu \phi_{Aj} \right] + \left[(\widetilde{D}_\mu \phi_B)^{\dagger}_j \widetilde{D}_\nu \phi_B^j + (\widetilde{D}_\nu \phi_B)^{\dagger}_j \widetilde{D}_\mu \phi_B^j \right] \\
& - \frac{1}{3} (\partial_\mu \partial_\nu - g_{\mu\nu} \partial^2) (\phi_A^{\dagger j} \phi_{Aj}) - \frac{1}{3} (\partial_\mu \partial_\nu - g_{\mu\nu} \partial^2) (\phi_{Bj}^\dagger \phi_B^j) \\
& + i \bar{\psi}^j (\gamma_\mu D_\nu + \gamma_\nu D_\mu) \psi_j - g_{\mu\nu} \left\{ i \bar{\psi}^j \gamma^\lambda D_\lambda \psi_j + (D^\lambda \phi_A)^{\dagger j} D_\mu \phi_{Aj} + \widetilde{D}^\lambda \phi_B^j (\widetilde{D}_\lambda \phi_B)^{\dagger}_j \right. \\
& + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=1}^2 (-1)^{i+1} g_{(i)} \left[\phi_A^{\dagger j} T^{a_i} \bar{\lambda}^{a_i} (1 - \gamma_5) \psi_j - \bar{\psi}^j (1 + \gamma_5) \lambda^{a_i} T^{a_i} \phi_{Aj} \right. \\
& \left. \left. - \bar{\psi}^j (1 - \gamma_5) \lambda^{a_i} T^{a_i} \phi_{Bj}^\dagger + \phi_B^j T^{a_i} \bar{\lambda}^{a_i} (1 + \gamma_5) \psi_j \right] - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 g_{(i)}^2 (\phi_A^{\dagger j} T^{a_i} \phi_{Aj} - \phi_B^j T^{a_i} \phi_{Bj}^\dagger)^2 \right. \\
& \left. + \text{superpotential terms} \right\} \\
s_\mu = & - \sum_{i=1}^2 \sigma_{\nu\rho} \gamma_\mu \lambda^{a_i} G^{(i)a_i\nu\rho} + \frac{1}{2} (D^\nu \phi_A)^{\dagger j} \gamma_\nu (1 + \gamma_5) \gamma_\mu \psi_j - \frac{1}{2} \widetilde{D}^\nu \phi_B^j \gamma_\nu (1 - \gamma_5) \gamma_\mu \psi_j
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_\nu (1 - \gamma_5) \gamma_\mu \left(C \bar{\psi}^{Tj} \right) D_\nu \phi_{Aj} - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_\nu (1 - \gamma_5) \gamma_\mu \left(C \bar{\psi}^{Tj} \right) \left(\widetilde{D}_\nu \phi_B \right)^\dagger \\
& - \frac{1}{3} i \sigma_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu \left[\phi_{Aj} (1 + \gamma_5) \left(C \bar{\psi}^{Tj} \right) + \phi_A^{j\dagger} (1 - \gamma_5) \psi_j \right] \\
& + \frac{1}{3} i \sigma_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu \left[\phi_{Bj}^\dagger (1 - \gamma_5) \left(C \bar{\psi}^{Tj} \right) + \phi_B^j (1 + \gamma_5) \psi_j \right] \\
& + 2\sqrt{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 (-1)^{i+1} g_{(i)} \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu \lambda^{a_i} \left[\phi_A^{j\dagger} T^{a_i} \phi_{Aj} - \phi_{Bj} T^{a_i} \phi_B^{j\dagger} \right] + \text{superpotential terms}; \\
j_\mu = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \bar{\lambda}^{a_i} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \lambda^{a_i} - \frac{1}{3} \bar{\psi}^j \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \psi_j - \frac{2i}{3} \left[\phi_A^{j\dagger} D_\mu \phi_{Aj} - (D_\mu \phi_A)^{j\dagger} \phi_{Aj} \right] \\
& - \frac{2i}{3} \left[\phi_B^j \left(\widetilde{D}_\mu \phi_{Bj} \right)^\dagger - \left(\widetilde{D}_\mu \phi_B \right)^j \phi_{Aj}^\dagger \right] + \text{superpotential terms}. \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

In above equation, λ^a and ψ are Majorana and Dirac spinors, respectively,

$$\lambda^a = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_\alpha^a \\ \bar{\lambda}^{a\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_j = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{Aj\alpha} \\ \bar{\psi}^{j\dot{\alpha}}_{Bj} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \left(C \bar{\psi}^T \right)^j = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{B\alpha}^j \\ \bar{\psi}^{j\dot{\alpha}}_A \end{pmatrix}. \tag{35}$$

Classically the above conservative currents satisfy $\theta^\mu_\mu = \gamma^\mu s_\mu = 0$ up to the classical superpotential terms. At quantum level the superconformal anomaly arises due to the non-vanishing β -functions of two gauge couplings. Let us first observe $U_R(1)$ symmetry anomaly. Eq. (35) shows that the chiral current j^μ is composed of gluinos λ^{a_i} , $(\psi_{Aj})^m_r$ and $(\psi_B^j)^r_m$. With respect to the first gauge group $SU(N+M)$, there are $2N$ flavor matters and λ^{a_1} in its adjoint representation. Hence they contribute $2N \times (-1/2) = -N$ and $C_2[SU(N+M)] = N+M$ to the anomaly coefficient. So for the first gauge field background, the chiral R -anomaly coefficient is $N+M-N=M$. A similar analysis for the second gauge group $SU(N)$ gives the chiral anomaly coefficient $-M$. Therefore, the chiral $U_R(1)$ R -symmetry anomaly reads

$$\partial_\mu j^\mu = \frac{M}{16\pi^2} \left(g_1^2 G_{\mu\nu}^{a_1} \tilde{G}^{a_1\mu\nu} - g_2^2 G_{\mu\nu}^{a_2} \tilde{G}^{a_2\mu\nu} \right) + \text{classical superpotential contribution}. \tag{36}$$

To show clearly the origin of the scale anomaly, we first consider the $SU(N) \times SU(N)$ gauge theory with chiral superfields A_j in $(N, \bar{N})$ and B^j in $(\bar{N}, N)$ representations. The exact NSVZ β -functions for those two gauge couplings,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(g_1^2) &= -\frac{g_1^3}{16\pi^2} [3N - 2N(1 - \gamma(g))], \\
\beta(g_2^2) &= \frac{g_2^3}{16\pi^2} [3N - 2N(1 - \gamma(g))], \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

shows the β -functions have zero-points with the anomalous dimension $\gamma(g) = -1/2$, at which the theory is a superconformal field theory. For the $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ gauge theory with chiral superfields A_j in $(N+M, \bar{N})$ and B^j in $(N, \bar{N} + \bar{M})$ representations, the above IR fixed points are removed since now the above β -functions become

$$\beta(g_1^2) = -\frac{3Mg_1^3}{16\pi^2}, \quad \beta(g_2^2) = \frac{3Mg_2^3}{16\pi^2}. \tag{38}$$

Consequently, the scale anomaly arises,

$$\theta^\mu{}_\mu = \frac{3M}{8\pi^2} \sum_{i=1}^2 (-1)^{i+1} g_i^2 \left[-\frac{1}{4} G^{(i)a_i\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu}^{(i)a_i} + \frac{1}{2} i \bar{\lambda}^{a_i} \gamma^\mu (\nabla_\mu \lambda)^{a_i} \right] + \text{classical superpotential contribution.} \quad (39)$$

Further, the beta functions (38) also implies the γ -trace anomaly of supersymmetry current,

$$\gamma^\mu s_\mu = \frac{3M}{8\pi^2} \sum_{i=1}^2 (-1)^{i+1} g_i^2 \left(-\sigma^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu}^{a_i} + \gamma_5 D^{a_i} \right) \lambda^{a_i} + \text{classical superpotential contribution.} \quad (40)$$

Similar to the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ pure supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory case, the above superconformal anomaly manifest itself in the quantum effective action as gauge coupling in superspace. The local part of the explicit gauge invariant quantum effective action composed only of gauge fields takes following form in superspace,

$$\Gamma_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{32\pi} \int d^2\theta \sum_{i=1}^2 \text{Im} \left[\Sigma_{(i)\text{eff}} \text{Tr} \left(W^{(i)\alpha} W_\alpha^{(i)} \right) \right] + \text{h.c.}, \quad (41)$$

where $\Sigma_{(i)\text{eff}}$ is given in Eq. (19). The effect of superconformal anomaly reflects as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{g_{(i)\text{eff}}^2(q^2)} &= \frac{1}{g_{(i)}^2(q_0^2)} + (-1)^{i+1} \frac{3M}{8\pi^2} \ln \frac{q_0}{q}, \\ \theta_{(i)\text{eff}}^{(\text{CP})} &= \theta_{(i)}^{(\text{CP})} + (-1)^{i+1} M, \\ \chi_{(i)\text{eff}} &= 0 + (-1)^{i+1} M. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

This ends our discussions on the superconformal anomaly in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ supersymmetric gauge theory.

III. HOLOGRAPHIC VERSION ON ADS/CFT CORRESPONDENCE, ON-SHELL GAUGED AdS_5 SUPERGRAVITY AND OFF-SHELL FOUR-DIMENSIONAL CONFORMAL SUPERGRAVITY

A. AdS/CFT Correspondence and Gauged Supergravity

The original AdS/CFT correspondence conjecture [2] states that type IIB superstring theory in $AdS_5 \times S^5$ geometrical background with N units of $R-R$ flux passing through S^5 describes the same physics as $\mathcal{N} = 4$ $SU(N)$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in four dimensions does. A concrete holographic definition on the AdS/CFT correspondence was given in Refs. [3] and [4], which has two versions. The first one is based on canonical quantization of a field theory, it states that quantum states of type IIB string in $AdS_5 \times S^5$ space-time background should have one-to-one correspondence with gauge invariant operators of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in four dimensions. Due to the difficulty in quantizing string theory in curved space-time, one can only establish correspondence

between supergravity modes on string theory side and certain operators of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory. The other version is expressed in terms of the path integral quantization, which states that the partition function of type II superstring should equal to the generating functional for the correlation functions of composite operators in a superconformal field theory defined on the boundary of AdS_5 space. Concretely speaking, given type II superstring theory in target space-time background $AdS_{d+1} \times X^{9-d}$ with X^{9-d} being a compact Einstein manifold, its partition function Z_{string} with bulk fields having non-trivial AdS_{d+1} boundary value takes the following form,

$$Z_{\text{string}}[\phi]|_{\phi \rightarrow \phi_0} = \int_{\phi(x,0)=\phi_0(x)} \mathcal{D}\phi(x,r) \exp(-S[\phi(x,r)]), \quad (43)$$

where $\phi_0(x)$ is the boundary value of the field function $\phi(x,r)$ in AdS_{d+1} bulk such as the graviton, gravitino, NS-NS and R-R antisymmetric tensor fields etc. On the other hand, the generating functional for correlation functions of gauge invariant operators $\mathcal{O}(x)$ in conformal field theory on the AdS_{d+1} boundary is

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\text{CFT}}[\phi_0] &= \left\langle \exp \int_{M^d} d^d x \mathcal{O}(x) \phi_0(x) \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_n \frac{1}{n!} \int \prod_{i=1}^n d^d x_i \langle \mathcal{O}_1(x_1) \cdots \mathcal{O}_n(x_n) \rangle \phi_0(x_1) \cdots \phi_0(x_n) \\ &\equiv \exp(-\tilde{\Gamma}_{\text{CFT}}[\phi_0]), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where $\Gamma[\phi_0]$ denotes the quantum effective action describing composite operators interacting with background field $\phi_0(x)$. The AdS/CFT correspondence means

$$Z_{\text{string}}[\phi]|_{\phi \rightarrow \phi_0} = Z_{\text{CFT}}[\phi_0]. \quad (45)$$

Since the string correction to type II supergravity is proportional to $1/\sqrt{g_s N}$, g_s being the string coupling, thus in the large- N limit, one can neglect string effect and just consider its low-energy effective theory, i.e., the type IIB supergravity. In this case, the partition function (43) of type IIB superstring can be evaluated with saddle-point approximation. That is, it is approximately equal to the exponential of supergravity action evaluated at the field configuration $\phi^{\text{cl}}[\phi_0]$ that satisfies the classical equation of motion of type II supergravity with the boundary value ϕ_0 ,

$$Z_{\text{string}}[\phi]|_{\phi \rightarrow \phi_0} = \exp(-S_{\text{SUGRAII}}[\phi^{\text{cl}}[\phi_0]]). \quad (46)$$

Comparing (46) with (44) and (45), we conclude that the background effective action of d -dimensional conformal field theory living on AdS_{d+1} boundary at large- N limit is approximately equal to on-shell classical action of AdS_{d+1} supergravity,

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\text{CFT}}[\phi_0]|_{N \rightarrow \infty} = S_{\text{SUGRAII}}[\phi^{\text{cl}}[\phi_0]] \quad (47)$$

Let us specialize to the $d = 4$ case and analyze the role of five-dimensional gauged supergravities [19,84,66] played in the AdS/CFT correspondence [73]. The $AdS_5 \times S^5$ space-time background arises from the near-horizon limit of $D3$ -brane solution of type IIB supergravity [31], so in $AdS_5 \times S^5$ background the spontaneous compactification on S^5 of type IIB

supergravity must occur [15]. Based on the assumption that there exists a consistent nonlinear truncation of massless modes from the whole Kaluza-Klein (K-K) spectrum of type IIB supergravity compactified on S^5 [16–18], the resultant theory should be $SO(6)(\cong SU(4))$ gauged $\mathcal{N} = 8$ AdS_5 supergravity since the isometry group $SO(6)$ of internal space S^5 becomes gauge group of the compactified theory and specifically, the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ background preserves all supersymmetries in type IIB supergravity [66]. In particular, the massive K-K modes correspond to irrelevant gauge invariant operators on field theory side [4]. The truncation of massive K-K modes in compactified type IIB supergravity means ignoring irrelevant operators in the quantum effective action $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\text{CFT}}[\phi_0]$ for gauge invariant field operators. So the AdS/CFT correspondence finally reduces to the equivalence between on-shell $\mathcal{N} = 8$ $SO(6)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity and the large- N limit of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal supergravity background furnished by the boundary data of gauged AdS_5 supergravity [4,83],

$$\Gamma_{\text{CFT}}[\phi_0]|_{N \rightarrow \infty} = S_{\text{AdS-SUGRA}}[\phi^{\text{cl}}[\phi_0]] \quad (48)$$

Further, there is a straightforward generalization. If the background for type IIB supergravity is $AdS_5 \times X^5$ with X^5 being an Einstein manifold less symmetric than S^5 such as $T^{1,1} = (SU(2) \times SU(2))/U(1)$, then due to the singularity in the internal manifold, the number of preserved supersymmetries in gauged AdS_5 supergravity is reduced and the gauge group of becomes smaller [74–77]. One can thus obtain the gauged $\mathcal{N} = 2, 4$ AdS_5 supergravities and their dual field theories should be $\mathcal{N} = 1, 2$ supersymmetric gauge theories [73,75–77]. Strictly speaking, the $\mathcal{N} = 1, 2$ quantum supersymmetric gauge theories are not conformal invariant since they have non-vanishing beta functions. However, it was shown that renormalization group flow of these supersymmetric gauge theories have the fixed point, at which the conformal invariance arises [76–82]. Therefore, the AdS/CFT correspondence between $\mathcal{N} = 2, 4$ gauged AdS_5 supergravities and the four-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 1, 2$ supersymmetric gauge theories at fixed-points of their renormalization group flow be established [73,75–77].

Eq. (48) means that the on-shell action of gauged AdS_5 supergravity equals to the quantum effective action of superconformal gauge theory in an external conformal supergravity background [4,83], only now the background field comes from the boundary value of supergravity in one-dimension-higher space-time. As introduced in Sect. II, a classical superconformal gauge theory in an external supergravity background suffers from superconformal anomaly, which should be contained in the background effective action. Therefore, the external superconformal anomaly can be extracted out from the on-shell action of gauged AdS_5 supergravity in terms of the AdS/CFT correspondence.

In following subsections we shall recall some typical features gauged $\mathcal{N} = 2, 4, 8$ supergravity in five dimensions and see how $\mathcal{N} = 1, 2, 4$ off-shell conformal supergravity in four dimensions arise from gauged supergravities.

B. $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ Gauged AdS_5 Supergravity and $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Conformal Supergravity in Four Dimensions

The ungauged $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity in five dimensions contains a graviton $\hat{e}_\alpha^m$, two gravitini $\hat{\psi}_\alpha^a$ and an Abelian vector field $\hat{A}_\alpha$ [65,19,89], $a = 1, 2$ being $SU(2)$ doublet index.

The theory has a global $USp(2) \cong SU(2)$ symmetry. The gravitini are $USp(2) \cong SU(2)$ doublets and symplectic Majorana spinors. The classical Lagrangian density is [65,19,89]

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{e}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\text{ungauged}} = & -\frac{1}{2} \widehat{R}[\widehat{\omega}] - \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\overline{\psi}}_{\alpha}^a \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} \widehat{\nabla}_{\beta} \widehat{\psi}_{\gamma a} - \frac{1}{4} a_{00} \widehat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \\ & + \frac{1}{6\sqrt{6}} \widehat{e}^{-1} C_{000} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma\delta} \widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \widehat{F}_{\gamma\sigma} \widehat{A}_{\delta} \\ & - \frac{3i}{8\sqrt{6}} h_0 \left(\widehat{\overline{\psi}}_{\alpha}^a \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \widehat{\psi}_{\beta a} \widehat{F}_{\gamma\delta} + 2 \widehat{\overline{\psi}}^{\alpha a} \widehat{\psi}_a^{\beta} \widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \right) + \text{four-fermion terms}, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The supersymmetry transformation laws are [19]

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \widehat{e}_{\alpha}^m &= \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\epsilon}^a \widehat{\gamma}^m \widehat{\psi}_{\alpha a}, \\ \delta \widehat{\psi}_{\alpha}^a &= \widehat{\nabla}_{\alpha} \widehat{\epsilon}^a + \frac{1}{4\sqrt{6}} i h_0 \left(\widehat{\gamma}_{\alpha}^{\beta\gamma} - 4 \delta_{\alpha}^{\beta} \widehat{\gamma}^{\gamma} \right) \widehat{F}_{\beta\gamma} \widehat{\epsilon}^a, \\ \delta \widehat{A}_{\alpha} &= \frac{\sqrt{6}}{2} i h^0 \widehat{\overline{\psi}}_{\alpha}^a \widehat{\epsilon}_a. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

The gauged $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity can be obtained from above ungauged supergravity by converting $U(1)$ subgroup of the global $SU(2)$ group into a local symmetry group and considering the vector field $\widehat{A}_{\alpha}$ as $U(1)$ gauge field. The space-time covariant derivative on gravitini should be enlarged to include $U(1)$ gauge covariance,

$$\widehat{D}_{\alpha} \widehat{\psi}_{\beta}^a = \widehat{\nabla}_{\alpha} \widehat{\psi}_{\beta}^a + g V_0 \widehat{A}_{\alpha} \delta^{ab} \widehat{\psi}_{\beta b}, \quad (51)$$

where g is the $U(1)$ gauge coupling. The gauged $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity action is [19]

$$\widehat{e}^{-1} \mathcal{L} = \widehat{e}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\text{un-gauged}} + g^2 P_0^2 - \frac{i\sqrt{6}}{8} g \widehat{\overline{\psi}}_{\alpha}^a \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\psi}_{\beta}^b \delta_{ab} P_0. \quad (52)$$

In Eqs. (49) and (52), a_{00} , h_0 and C_{000} are parameters that can be determined by $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry; P_0 is the scalar potential when this $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity couples with matter fields, while in the case at hand, it is a pure supergravity, P_0 is just a parameter.

We require that the above $U(1)$ gauged $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity (52) has domain wall solution which should asymptotically approach AdS_5 vacuum configuration. The solution thus presents the following standard form,

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \frac{l^2}{r^2} \left[\widehat{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, r) dx^{\mu} dx^{\nu} + dr^2 \right], \\ \widehat{A}_{\alpha} &= \widehat{\psi}_{\alpha}^a = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

This requirement fixes the parameters in the Lagrangian (52) as the following [19,23],

$$\begin{aligned} g &= \frac{3}{4}, \quad h_0 = \frac{l}{2} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad h^0 = \frac{1}{h_0}, \quad V_0 = 1, \quad P_0 = 2h^0 V_0 = \frac{4}{l} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}, \\ a_{00} &= (h_0)^2 = \frac{3l^2}{8}, \quad C_{000} = \frac{5}{2} h_0^3 - \frac{3}{2} a_{00} h_0 = \frac{3\sqrt{6}l^3}{32}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

It should be emphasized that the space-time background described by AdS_5 solution (53) preserves the full $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry. Consequently, the Lagrangian density (55) up to the quadratic terms of fermionic field becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}^{-1}\mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{2}\hat{R}[\hat{\omega}] - \frac{1}{2}\bar{\psi}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} \widehat{D}_\beta \hat{\psi}_{\gamma a} - \frac{3l^2}{32}\hat{F}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{F}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{l^3}{64}\hat{e}^{-1}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma\delta}\hat{F}_{\alpha\beta}\hat{F}_{\gamma\sigma}\hat{A}_\delta \\ & - \frac{3}{4l}i\bar{\psi}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta^b \delta_{ab} - \frac{3l}{32}i\left(\bar{\psi}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\hat{\psi}_{\beta a}\hat{F}_{\gamma\delta} + 2\bar{\psi}^{\alpha a}\hat{\psi}_a^\beta \hat{F}_{\alpha\beta}\right) - \frac{6}{l^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

The supersymmetry transformation at the leading order of fermionic field reads

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\hat{e}_\alpha^m &= \frac{1}{2}\bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^m \hat{\psi}_{\alpha a}, \\ \delta\hat{\psi}_\alpha^a &= \widehat{D}_\alpha \hat{\epsilon}^a + \frac{il}{16}\left(\hat{\gamma}_\alpha^{\beta\delta} - 4\delta_\alpha^\beta \hat{\gamma}^\delta\right)\hat{F}_{\beta\delta}\epsilon^a + \frac{i}{2l}g\hat{\gamma}_\alpha\delta^{ab}\hat{\epsilon}_b, \\ \delta\hat{A}_\alpha &= \frac{i}{l}\bar{\psi}_\alpha \hat{\epsilon}_a. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

In the following we choose the above AdS_5 solution (53) as a vacuum configuration for this $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged supergravity. Then we expand the theory around this vacuum configuration and derive classical equations of motion for $\hat{g}_{\alpha\beta}$, $\hat{\psi}_\alpha^i$ and $\hat{A}_\alpha$. The dynamical behavior of gauged supergravity near AdS_5 vacuum configuration can be observed by solving linearized equations of motion. Geometrically, this is actually a process of revealing the asymptotic behavior of the bulk fields near the boundary of AdS_5 space.

The linearized classical equations of motion for graviton $\hat{g}_{\alpha\beta}$, gravi-photon $\hat{A}_\alpha$ and gravitini $\hat{\psi}_\alpha^i$ are (linearized) Einstein-, Maxwell- and Rarita-Schwinger equations, respectively,

$$\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{g}_{\alpha\beta}\hat{R} - \frac{6}{l^2}\hat{g}_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \quad (57)$$

$$\hat{e}^{-1}\partial_\alpha \left[\hat{g}^{\alpha\delta}\partial_\delta \hat{A}_\beta(x, r) \right] = 0, \quad (58)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}\widehat{D}_\beta \hat{\psi}_{\gamma a} + \frac{3i}{2}\delta_{ab}\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{\psi}_\beta^b = 0. \quad (59)$$

The solutions to these equations near AdS_5 boundary (given by $r \rightarrow 0$) can be expressed as a series expansion in terms of r/l . Here we consider only the leading order in the expansion given in Ref. [23]. First, the AdS_5 vacuum configuration (53) and the partial gauge-fixing choice on diffeomorphism symmetry in r -direction determine that the solution to Einstein equation (57) at the leading order of r/l expansions should be the following [23],

$$\hat{e}_\mu^s(x, r) = \frac{l}{r}e_\mu^s(x) + \mathcal{O}(r/l), \quad \hat{e}_4^r = \hat{e}_\mu^4 = 0, \quad \hat{e}_4^4 = \frac{l}{r} + \mathcal{O}(r/l). \quad (60)$$

The background solution and torsion-free condition $d\hat{e}^r + \hat{\omega}_s^r \wedge \hat{e}^s = 0$ yield spin connections,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\omega}_4^r(x, r) &= -\hat{e}^r(x, r) = -\frac{l}{r}e^a(x), \\ \hat{\omega}_s^r(x, r) &= \omega_s^r(x). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

To solve the Maxwell equation (58), one should first fix $U(1)$ gauge symmetry in r -direction. The most convenient choice is

$$\widehat{A}_4(x, r) = 0. \quad (62)$$

Subsequently, Eq. (58) leads to

$$\widehat{A}_\mu(x, r) = A_\mu(x) + \mathcal{O}(r/l). \quad (63)$$

For gravitino equation (59), the gauge choice of fixing local supersymmetry in radial direction that is consistent with bulk supersymmetry transformation is

$$\widehat{\psi}_4^a(x, r) = 0. \quad (64)$$

The spin connection (61) and the gauge field (63) as well as the gauge choices (62) and (64) lead to the near- AdS_5 boundary reduction of bulk covariant derivatives,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{D}_4 &= \partial_4, \quad \widehat{D}_\mu = \widetilde{D}_\mu(x) - \frac{1}{2r} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5, \\ \widetilde{D}_\mu(x) &\equiv \nabla_\mu + \frac{1}{4} \omega_\mu^{rs} \gamma_{rs} + \frac{3}{4} A_\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where the convention for $\widehat{\gamma}$ -matrix is chosen as the following,

$$\gamma_r = \widehat{\gamma}_r, \quad \widehat{\gamma}_\mu = \widehat{e}_\mu^r \widehat{\gamma}_r = \frac{l}{r} \gamma_\mu, \quad \widehat{\gamma}^\mu = \widehat{e}^\mu_r \widehat{\gamma}^r = \frac{r}{l} \gamma^\mu, \quad \gamma_5 = \widehat{\gamma}^4 = \widehat{\gamma}_4, \quad \gamma_5^2 = 1. \quad (66)$$

The linearized gravitino equation (58) reduces to

$$\widehat{\gamma}^{\mu\nu} \left(\delta_{ab} \partial_r - \frac{1}{r} \delta_{ab} - \frac{3}{2r} \gamma_5 \epsilon_{ab} \right) \widehat{\psi}_\nu^b(x, r) - \widehat{\gamma}^{\mu\nu\rho} \widetilde{D}_\nu(x) \gamma_5 \widehat{\psi}_{\rho a}(x, r) = 0. \quad (67)$$

The above equation can be diagonalized by combining those two components of symplectic Majorana spinor, $\widehat{\psi}_\mu \equiv \widehat{\psi}_{\mu 1} + i \widehat{\psi}_{\mu 2}$, and performing chiral decomposition $\widehat{\psi}_\mu^R \equiv (1 - \gamma_5)/2 \widehat{\psi}_\mu$, $\widehat{\psi}_\mu^L \equiv (1 + \gamma_5)/2 \widehat{\psi}_\mu$. Near AdS_5 boundary ($r \rightarrow 0$), Eq. (67) gives the equation for $\widehat{\psi}_\mu^R$ [23]

$$\left(\partial_r + \frac{1}{2r} \right) \widehat{\psi}_\mu^R(x, r) = 0, \quad (68)$$

and hence the radial dependence of $\widehat{\psi}_\mu^R$ is

$$\widehat{\psi}_\mu^R(x, r) = \left(\frac{2l}{r} \right)^{1/2} \psi_\mu^R(x). \quad (69)$$

The left-handed component is not independent, and its radial coordinate dependence turned out to be [23]

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\psi}_\mu^L &= (2lr)^{1/2} \chi_\mu^L(x), \\ \chi_\mu^L &= \frac{1}{3} \gamma^\nu \left(\widetilde{D}_\mu \psi_\nu^R - \widetilde{D}_\nu \psi_\mu^R \right) - \frac{i}{12} \epsilon_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda\rho} \gamma_5 \gamma^\nu \left(\widetilde{D}_\lambda \psi_\rho^R - \widetilde{D}_\rho \psi_\lambda^R \right). \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

The near- AdS_5 boundary solutions listed in Eqs. (60), (63), (69) and (70) show that on-shell $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged supergravity multiplet $(\hat{e}_\alpha^m, \hat{\psi}_\alpha^a, \hat{A}_\alpha)$ reduces to the boundary field $(e_\mu^a, \psi_\mu^R, A_\mu)$. To reveal the physical features described by these boundary fields, we check the boundary reduction of bulk supersymmetry transformation law realized on $(e_\mu^a, \psi_\mu^R, A_\mu)$. First, the same as that done on bulk gravitino fields, we combine the bulk supersymmetric transformation parameter, $\hat{\epsilon}(x, r) = \hat{\epsilon}_1(x, r) + i\hat{\epsilon}_2(x, r)$ and decompose it into chiral components. Then we choose the radial coordinate dependence of $\hat{\epsilon}^{L,R}$ in the same way as bulk gravitino,

$$\hat{\epsilon}^R(x, r) = \left(\frac{2l}{r}\right)^{1/2} \epsilon^R(x), \quad \hat{\epsilon}^L(x, r) = (2lr)^{1/2} \eta^L(x). \quad (71)$$

At the leading order of r/l expansion, the bulk supersymmetry transformation (56) becomes the following [23],

$$\begin{aligned} \delta e_\mu^r &= -\frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}_\mu \gamma^r \epsilon, \\ \delta \psi_\mu &= \widetilde{D}_\mu \epsilon - \gamma_\mu \eta = \nabla_\mu \epsilon - \frac{3i}{4} A_\mu \gamma_5 \epsilon - \gamma_\mu \eta, \\ \delta A_\mu &= i \left(\bar{\psi}_\mu \gamma_5 \eta - \bar{\chi}_\mu \gamma_5 \epsilon \right), \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where all the spinorial quantities, $\psi_\mu(x)$, $\chi_\mu(x)$, $\epsilon(x)$ and $\eta(x)$ are Majorana spinors constructed from their two-component chiral spinors $\psi_\mu^R(x)$, $\chi_\mu^L(x)$, $\epsilon^R(x)$ and $\eta^L(x)$. One can immediately recognize that Eq. (72) is the supersymmetric transformation law for the four-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 1$ conformal supergravity with ϵ and η being Poincaré- and conformal supersymmetry transformation parameters, respectively [20,21].

Further, it can be easily checked that other symmetries in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged supergravity near AdS_5 vacuum configuration also convert into those in the four-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 1$ conformal supergravity. For examples, the bulk diffeomorphism invariance decomposes into the four-dimensional diffeomorphism symmetry and the Weyl symmetry [25], and the bulk supersymmetry converts into the Poincaré supersymmetry and the conformal supersymmetry in four dimensions [23]. Therefore, the AdS_5 boundary reduction of on-shell $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged supergravity constitutes the 8+8 off-shell multiplet of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions [23]. The matching of degrees of freedom between the on-shell multiplet $(\hat{e}_\alpha^m, \hat{\psi}_\alpha^a, \hat{A}_\alpha)$ and off-shell multiplet $(e_\mu^r, \psi_\mu^R, A_\mu)$ are listed in Table I.

TABLES

On-shell 5-D $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ Gauged Supergravity	Off-shell 4-D $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Conformal Supergravity
$\widehat{e}_\alpha^m$: $1/2 \times (5-2)(5-2+1) - 1 = 5$	e_μ^r : $4 \times 4 - 4 - 6 - 1 = 5$
$\widehat{A}_\alpha$: $5 - 2 = 3$	A_μ : $4 - 1 = 3$
$\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a$: $1/2 \times (5-3) \times 4 \times 2 = 8$	ψ_μ : $4 \times 4 - 4 - 4 = 8$
$8 + 8$	$8 + 8$

TABLE I. Field correspondence and matching of degrees of freedom between on-shell five-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged supergravity and off-shell $\mathcal{N} = 1$ conformal conformal in four dimensions.

On-shell 5-D $\mathcal{N} = 4$ $SU(2) \times U(1)$ Gauged Supergravity	Off-shell 4-D $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Conformal Supergravity
$\widehat{e}_\alpha^m$: $1/2 \times (5-2)(5-2+1) - 1 = 5$	e_μ^r : $4 \times 4 - 4 - 6 - 1 = 5$
$\widehat{W}_\alpha^I$: $(5-2) \times 3 = 9$	$A_{\mu j}^i$: $(4-1) \times 3 = 9$
$\widehat{A}_\alpha$: $5 - 2 = 3$	a_μ : $4 - 1 = 3$
$\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p$: $1/2 \times 3 \times 2 \times 2 = 6$	$B_{\mu\nu}$: $1/2 \times 4 \times 3 = 6$
$\widehat{\phi}$: 1	ϕ : 1
$\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a$: $1/2 \times (5-3) \times 4 \times 4 = 16$	ψ_μ^i : $(4 \times 4 - 4 - 4) \times 2 = 16$
$\widehat{\chi}^a$: $1/2 \times 4 \times 4 = 8$	χ^i : $4 \times 2 = 8$
$24+24$	$24+24$

TABLE II. Field correspondence and degree of freedom matching between five-dimensional on-shell $\mathcal{N} = 4$ $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauged supergravity and off-shell $\mathcal{N} = 2$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions.

On-shell 5-D $\mathcal{N} = 8$ $SO(6)$ Gauged Supergravity	Off-shell 4-D $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Conformal Supergravity
$\widehat{e}_\alpha{}^m$: $1/2 \times (5-2)(5-2+1) - 1 = 5$	$e_\mu{}^r$: $4 \times 4 - 4 - 6 - 1 = 5$
$\widehat{W}_\alpha{}^{IJ}$: $(5-2) \times 15 = 45$	$V_{\mu j}^i$: $(4-1) \times (4^2-1) = 45$
$\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{Ip}$: $1/2 \times 3 \times 2 \times 6 \times 2 = 36$	$B_{\mu\nu}{}^{[ij]}$: $1/2 \times 4 \times 3 \times 6 = 36$
$V^{IJab}, V_{Ip}{}^{ab}$: 42	ϕ : 2 E_{ij} : $1/2 \times 4 \times (4+1) \times 2 = 20$ $D^{ij}{}_{kl}$: $6 \times 6 - 4 \times 4 = 20$
$\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a$: $1/2 \times (5-3) \times 4 \times 8 = 32$	ψ_μ^i : $(4 \times 4 - 4 - 4) \times 4 = 32$
$\widehat{\chi}^{abc}$: $1/2 \times (56-8) \times 4 = 96$	χ^i : $4 \times 4 = 16$ $\lambda^{ij}{}_k$: $(6 \times 4 - 4) \times 4 = 80$
128+128	128+128

TABLE III. Field correspondence and degree of freedom matching between on-shell five-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 8$ $SO(6)$ gauged supergravity and off-shell $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions.

C. Off-shell $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Conformal Supergravity in Four Dimensions from On-shell $\mathcal{N} = 4$ $SU(2) \times U(1)$ Gauged AdS_5 Supergravity

All $\mathcal{N} = 2k < 8$ ($k=1,2,4$) supergravities in five dimensions can be obtained through consistent truncations on $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity. This procedure is actually the dimensional reduction in the representation spaces of global $E_{6(6)}$ group and local $USp(8)$ group in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity [65]. In the following we introduce $\mathcal{N} = 4$ $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauged supergravity in five dimensions [65,84–86] and show how its classical dynamics near AdS_5 vacuum configuration leads to the off-shell conformal supergravity in four dimensions. The ungauged $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supergravity in five dimensions has both global $USp(4)$ and local $USp(4)$ symmetries. The field content consists of a graviton $\widehat{e}_\alpha^m$, four gravitini $\widehat{\psi}_{\alpha a}$ and four spin-1/2 fields $\widehat{\chi}_a$ in the fundamental representation **4** of the global and local $USp(4)$, five vector fields $\widehat{W}_\mu^{[ab]}$ in representation **5** of $USp(4)$, one vector field $\widehat{A}_\mu$ and one scalar field $\widehat{\phi}$ in the trivial representation of $USp(4)$. All the fermionic fields are $USp(4)$ symplectic Majorana spinors, i.e., they satisfy $\widehat{\bar{\lambda}}^a = \widehat{\lambda}_a^\star \widehat{\gamma}_0 = \widehat{\lambda}^{iT} \widehat{C}$. The indices $a, b = 1, \dots, 4$ label the fundamental representation of $USp(4)$. The fundamental representation of $USp(4)$ is actually a $SO(5)$ spinor representation since there exists the isomorphism $USp(4) \cong \text{Spin}(5)$. Thus, the various representations of $USp(4)$ can be obtained with the representation of five Euclidean dimensional Clifford algebra generated by $(\Gamma_i)_a^b$,

$$(\Gamma_i)_a^c (\Gamma_j)_c^b + (\Gamma_j)_a^c (\Gamma_i)_c^b = 2\delta_{ij} \delta_a^b \quad (73)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, 5$ are the vector indices of $\text{Spin}(5)$. In particular, the adjoint representation of $USp(4) \cong \text{Spin}(5)$ is given by $(\Gamma_{ij})_a^b = i/2 [\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j]_a^b$.

The Lagrangian density for the ungauged case is [84]

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{e}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\text{ungauged}} = & -\frac{1}{2} \widehat{R}[\widehat{\omega}] - \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\bar{\psi}}_\alpha \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \widehat{\nabla}_\beta \widehat{\psi}_{\delta a} - \frac{1}{4} \xi^2 \widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^{ab} \widehat{W}_{ab}^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{4} \xi^{-4} \widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \widehat{F}^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\bar{\chi}}^a \widehat{\gamma}^\alpha \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \widehat{\chi}_a \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \partial^\alpha \widehat{\phi} \partial_\alpha \widehat{\phi} - \frac{1}{2} i \widehat{\bar{\chi}}^a \widehat{\gamma}^\alpha \widehat{\gamma}^\beta \widehat{\psi}_{\alpha a} \partial_\beta \widehat{\phi} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{6} \xi \widehat{\bar{\chi}}_a \widehat{\gamma}^\alpha \widehat{\gamma}^{\beta\delta} \widehat{\psi}_{\alpha b} \widehat{W}_{\beta\delta}^{ab} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} \xi^{-2} \widehat{\bar{\chi}}^a \widehat{\gamma}^\alpha \widehat{\gamma}^{\beta\delta} \widehat{\psi}_{\alpha a} \widehat{F}_{\beta\delta} \\ & - \frac{i}{12} \xi \widehat{\bar{\chi}}_a \widehat{\gamma}^{\beta\delta} \widehat{\psi}_{ab} \widehat{W}_{\beta\delta}^{ab} + \frac{5i}{24\sqrt{2}} \xi^{-2} \widehat{\bar{\chi}}^a \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\chi}_a \widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{4} i \xi \left(\widehat{\bar{\psi}}_\alpha \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma} \widehat{\psi}_\beta^b + 2 \widehat{\bar{\psi}}^{\delta a} \widehat{\psi}^{\sigma b} \right) \widehat{W}_{\delta\sigma ab} \\ & - \frac{i}{8\sqrt{2}} \xi^{-2} \left(\widehat{\bar{\psi}}^a \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma} \widehat{\psi}_{\beta a} + 2 \widehat{\bar{\psi}}^{\delta a} \widehat{\psi}_a^\sigma \right) \widehat{F}_{\delta\sigma} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{8} \widehat{e}^{-1} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma} \widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^{ab} \widehat{W}_{\gamma\delta ab} \widehat{A}_\sigma \\ & + \text{four-fermion terms}, \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= \exp(1/\sqrt{3}\widehat{\phi}), \\ \widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta} &= \partial_\alpha \widehat{A}_\beta - \partial_\beta \widehat{A}_\alpha, \\ \widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^{ab} &= \partial_\alpha \widehat{W}_\beta^{[ab]} - \partial_\beta \widehat{W}_\alpha^{[ab]} + [\widehat{W}_\alpha, \widehat{W}_\beta]^{[ab]}. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

The gauge group is the subgroup $SU(2) \times U(1)$ of global $USp(4)$ group [85]. The reason for choosing such a gauge group is based on the existence of AdS_5 solution to the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ gauged supergravity. The $\mathcal{N} = 4$ anti-de Sitter supergroup in five dimensions is $SU(2, 2|2)$ and its maximal bosonic subgroup is $SU(2, 2) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$, while $SU(2, 2) \cong SO(4, 2)$

is the space-time symmetry group of AdS_5 , thus one can gauge the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ group to get an $\mathcal{N} = 4$ gauged supergravity. To complete this gauge procedure one should first branch field representations of $USp(4)$ into the representations $SU(2) \times U(1)$. In this way the transformation behaviors of fields with respect to gauge group $SU(2) \times U(1)$ can be naturally obtained from the $USp(4)$ representations in the ungauged case. First, the adjoint representation of $USp(4)$ decomposes into

$$\begin{aligned} 10 &= 3 \oplus 1 \oplus 3 \oplus 3 \\ J_{ij} &= J_{IJ} \oplus J_{45} \oplus J_{I4} \oplus J_{I5}, \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

where $I, J, K = 1, 2, 3$ denote $SU(2)$ group indices. Note that above generators have representations in terms of Clifford algebra generators, one has the representation

$$\begin{aligned} J_{ij} &= \frac{i}{2} [\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j], \\ J_{IJ} &= \frac{i}{2} [\Gamma_I, \Gamma_J] \sim \epsilon_{IJK} \Gamma^{K45}, \\ J_{45} &= i\Gamma_4 \Gamma_5, \quad J_{4I} = i\Gamma_4 \Gamma_I, \quad J_{5I} = i\Gamma_5 \Gamma_I. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

The spinor and vector representations of the global $USp(4)$ are branched with respect to $SU(2) \times U(1)$ as the following,

$$\begin{aligned} 4 &= 2_{1/2} \oplus 2_{-1/2}; \\ 5 &= 3_0 \oplus 1_1 \oplus 1_{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

That is, the five vector fields $\widehat{W}_\alpha^{[ab]}$ convert into the $SU(2)$ gauge fields $\widehat{W}_\alpha^I \Gamma_{I45}$ and two vector fields $\widehat{W}_\alpha^p$ ($p = 1, 2$) with $SO(2) \cong U(1)$ -charged. Further, $\widehat{W}_\alpha^p$ are replaced their Hodge dual $\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p$ and specifically the tensor field $\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p$ should satisfy self-dual condition, $\widehat{B}^p \propto \epsilon^{pq} \widehat{B}_q$, which keeps $\widehat{B}^p$ (equivalently $\widehat{W}_\alpha^p$ massless). The vector $\widehat{W}_\alpha^I$ and $\widehat{A}_\alpha$ shall act as $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge fields with the coupling constant g_1 and g_2 . Therefore, the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ covariant derivatives acting on a spinor $\widehat{\psi}_a$, a vector $\widehat{X}^{Ip}$ and scalar $\widehat{\phi}$ should take the form,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{D}_\alpha \psi_a &= \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \widehat{\psi}_a + \frac{1}{2} g_1 \widehat{A}_\alpha (\Gamma_{45})_a{}^b \widehat{\psi}_b + \frac{1}{2} g_2 \widehat{W}_\alpha^I (\Gamma_{I45})_a{}^b \widehat{\psi}_b, \\ \widehat{D}_\alpha X^{Ip} &= \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \widehat{X}^{Ip} + g_1 \widehat{A}_\alpha \epsilon^{pq} \widehat{X}^{Iq} + g_2 \epsilon^{IJK} \widehat{W}_\alpha^J \widehat{X}^{Kp}, \\ \widehat{D}_\alpha \widehat{\phi} &= \partial_\alpha \widehat{\phi} - i g_1 \widehat{A}_\alpha \widehat{\phi}. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

The Lagrangian of gauged $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supergravity with the gauge group $SU(2) \times U(1)$ is [85]

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{e}^{-1} \mathcal{L} &= -\frac{1}{4} \widehat{R}[\widehat{\omega}] - \frac{1}{2} i \widehat{\bar{\psi}}_\alpha \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \widehat{D}_\beta \widehat{\psi}_{\delta a} + \frac{1}{2} i \widehat{\bar{\chi}}^a \widehat{\gamma}^\alpha \widehat{D}_\alpha \widehat{\chi}_a + \frac{1}{2} \widehat{D}^\alpha \widehat{\phi} \widehat{D}_\alpha \widehat{\phi} - \frac{1}{4} \xi^{-4} \widehat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \xi^2 \left(\widehat{W}^{I\alpha\beta} \widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^I + \widehat{B}^{\alpha\beta p} \widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p \right) + \frac{1}{4} \widehat{e}^{-1} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{g_1} \epsilon_{pq} \widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p \widehat{D}_\gamma \widehat{B}_{\delta\sigma}^q - \widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^I \widehat{W}_{\gamma\delta}^I \widehat{A}_\sigma \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}} \left(H_{\alpha\beta}^{ab} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} h_{\alpha\beta}^{ab} \right) \widehat{\bar{\psi}}_a \widehat{\gamma}_{[\delta} \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\gamma}_{\sigma]} \widehat{\psi}_b^\sigma + \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}} \left(H_{\alpha\beta}^{ab} - \sqrt{2} h_{\alpha\beta}^{ab} \right) \widehat{\bar{\psi}}_a \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\gamma}_{\delta]} \chi_b \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{i}{12\sqrt{2}} \left(H_{\alpha\beta}^{ab} - \frac{5}{\sqrt{2}} h_{\alpha\beta}^{ab} \right) \bar{\chi}_a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\chi}_b + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \widehat{D}_\beta \hat{\phi} \bar{\psi}_\alpha^a \hat{\gamma}^\beta \hat{\gamma}^\alpha \hat{\chi}_a + \frac{3}{2} i T_{ab} \bar{\psi}_\alpha^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\psi}_\beta^b \\
& -i A_{ab} \hat{\psi}_\alpha^a \hat{\gamma}^\alpha \hat{\chi}^b + i \left(\frac{1}{2} T_{ab} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} A_{ab} \right) \bar{\chi}^a \hat{\chi}^b + \left(3 T_{ab} T^{ab} - \frac{1}{4} A^{ab} A_{ab} \right) \\
& + P[\hat{\phi}] + \text{four-fermion terms},
\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\alpha\beta}^{ab} &= \xi \left[\widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^I (\Gamma_I)^{ab} + \widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p (\Gamma_p)^{ab} \right], \\
h_{\alpha\beta}^{ab} &= \xi^{-2} \Omega^{ab} \widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta}, \\
T^{ab} &= \left(\frac{1}{6\sqrt{2}} g_2 \xi^{-1} + \frac{1}{12} g_1 \xi^2 \right) (\Gamma_{45})^{ab}, \\
A^{ab} &= \left(\frac{1}{6\sqrt{2}} g_2 \xi^{-1} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} g_1 \xi^2 \right) (\Gamma_{45})^{ab},
\end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

and the scalar potential $P[\hat{\phi}]$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
P[\hat{\phi}] &= 3 T_{ab} T^{ab} - \frac{1}{4} A^{ab} A_{ab} \\
&= \frac{1}{8} g_2 \left(g_2 \xi^{-2} + 2\sqrt{2} g_1 \xi \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

The corresponding supersymmetry transformations to the leading order of fermionic terms is listed as following [85],

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \hat{e}_\alpha^m &= i \bar{\psi}_\alpha^a \hat{\gamma}^m \hat{e}_a, \\
\delta \widehat{W}_\alpha^I &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \xi^{-1} \left(-\bar{\psi}^a \hat{\epsilon}^b + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \bar{\chi}^a \hat{\gamma}_\alpha \hat{\epsilon}^b \right) (\Gamma^I)_{ab}, \\
\delta \widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p &= 2 \widehat{D}_{[\alpha} \left[\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \xi^{-1} \left(-\bar{\psi}_{\beta]} \hat{\epsilon}^b + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \bar{\chi} \hat{\gamma}_{\beta]} \hat{\epsilon}^b \right) (\Gamma^p)_{ab} \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} i g_1 \epsilon^{pq} (\Gamma_q)_{ab} \xi \left(\bar{\psi}_{[\alpha} \hat{\gamma}_{\beta]} \hat{\epsilon}^b + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \bar{\chi}^a \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta} \hat{\epsilon}^b \right), \\
\delta \widehat{A}_\alpha &= \frac{i}{2} \xi^2 \left(\bar{\psi}_\alpha \hat{\epsilon}_a + \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \bar{\chi}^a \hat{\gamma}_\alpha \hat{\epsilon}_a \right), \\
\delta \hat{\phi} &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{\chi}^a \hat{\epsilon}_a, \\
\delta \hat{\psi}_\alpha^a &= \widehat{D}_\alpha \hat{\epsilon}^a + \hat{\gamma}_\alpha T^{ab} \hat{\epsilon}_b - \frac{1}{6\sqrt{2}} \left(\hat{\gamma}_\alpha^{\beta\delta} - 4 \delta_\alpha^\beta \gamma^\delta \right) \left(H_{\beta\delta}^{ab} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} h_{\beta\delta}^{ab} \right) \hat{\epsilon}_b, \\
\delta \hat{\chi}_a &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \widehat{D}_\alpha \hat{\phi} \hat{\epsilon}_a + A_{ab} \hat{\epsilon}^b - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \left(H_{\alpha\beta ab} - \sqrt{2} h_{\alpha\beta ab} \right) \hat{\epsilon}^b.
\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

It was found in Ref. [85] that when $g_2 = \sqrt{2} g_1$ there exists a classical AdS_5 solution to this gauged supergravity which preserves the full $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetry [85,68,67]. The

explicit form of AdS_5 solution is the same as that given in (53) and all other fields vanish. The cosmological constant Λ comes from the scalar potential at its extremum $\phi = 0$ ³

$$\Lambda = 4P[\hat{\phi}_0 = 0] = \frac{3}{2}g^2 = \frac{12}{l^2}. \quad (84)$$

and subsequently

$$g = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{l}. \quad (85)$$

We expand above $\mathcal{N} = 4$ gauged supergravity around the AdS_5 vacuum configuration and rescale on bulk gauge fields and gauge coupling,

$$\widehat{W}_\alpha^I \longrightarrow l\widehat{W}_\alpha^I, \quad \widehat{A}_\alpha \longrightarrow l\widehat{A}_\alpha, \quad g \longrightarrow lg. \quad (86)$$

The linearized classical action near above AdS_5 vacuum configuration is

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{e}^{-1}\mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{4}\widehat{R}[\widehat{\omega}] - \frac{1}{2}i\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a\widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta}\widehat{D}_\beta\widehat{\psi}_{\delta a} + \frac{1}{2}i\widehat{\chi}^a\widehat{\gamma}^\alpha\widehat{D}_\alpha\chi_a + \frac{1}{2}\partial^\alpha\widehat{\phi}\partial_\alpha\widehat{\phi} \\ & -\frac{l^2}{4}\widehat{F}^{\alpha\beta}\widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{4}\left(l^2\widehat{W}^{I\alpha\beta}\widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^I + \widehat{B}^{\alpha\beta p}\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p\right) \\ & +\frac{1}{4}\widehat{e}^{-1}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma}\left(\frac{l}{2}\epsilon_{pq}\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p\widehat{D}_\gamma\widehat{B}_{\delta\sigma}^q - l^3\widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^I\widehat{W}_{\gamma\delta}^I\widehat{A}_\sigma\right) \\ & +\frac{il}{4\sqrt{2}}\left[\widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^I(\Gamma_I)^{ab} + \frac{1}{l}\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p(\Gamma_p)^{ab} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Omega^{ab}\widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta}\right]\widehat{\psi}_a^\delta\widehat{\gamma}_{[\delta}\widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\widehat{\gamma}_{\sigma]}\widehat{\psi}_b^\sigma \\ & +\frac{il}{2\sqrt{6}}\left[\widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^I(\Gamma_I)^{ab} + \frac{1}{l}\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p(\Gamma_p)^{ab} - \sqrt{2}\Omega^{ab}\widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta}\right]\widehat{\psi}_a^\delta\widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\widehat{\gamma}_{\delta]}\widehat{\chi}_b \\ & -\frac{il}{12\sqrt{2}}\left[\widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^I(\Gamma_I)^{ab} + \frac{1}{l}\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p(\Gamma_p)^{ab} - \frac{5}{\sqrt{2}}\Omega^{ab}\widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta}\right]\widehat{\chi}_a\gamma^{\alpha\beta}\widehat{\chi}_b \\ & +\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\partial_\alpha\widehat{\phi}\widehat{\psi}_\beta^a\widehat{\gamma}^\alpha\widehat{\gamma}^\beta\widehat{\chi}_a + \frac{3i}{4l}(\Gamma_{45})_{ab}\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a\widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\widehat{\psi}_\beta^b + \frac{i}{4l}(\Gamma_{45})_{ab}\widehat{\chi}^a\widehat{\chi}^b \\ & +\frac{3}{l^2} + \text{four-fermion terms}. \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

The supersymmetry transformation law (83) at the leading order of fermionic terms becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\widehat{e}_\alpha^m &= i\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a\widehat{\gamma}^m\widehat{\epsilon}_a, \\ \delta\widehat{W}_\alpha^I &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}l}\left(-\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a\widehat{\epsilon}^b + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\widehat{\chi}^a\widehat{\gamma}_\alpha\widehat{\epsilon}^b\right)(\Gamma^I)_{ab}, \\ \delta\widehat{A}_\alpha &= \frac{i}{2l}\left(\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a\widehat{\epsilon}_a + \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}\widehat{\chi}^a\widehat{\gamma}_\alpha\widehat{\epsilon}_a\right), \end{aligned}$$

³Note that this convention is different from that in Ref. [85].

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \widehat{D}_\alpha \left(-\widehat{\psi}_\beta^a \widehat{\epsilon}^b + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \widehat{\chi}^a \widehat{\gamma}_\beta \widehat{\epsilon}^b \right) (\Gamma^p)_{ab} \\
&\quad - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \widehat{D}_\beta \left(-\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a \widehat{\epsilon}^b + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \widehat{\chi}^a \widehat{\gamma}_\alpha \widehat{\epsilon}^b \right) (\Gamma^p)_{ab} \\
&\quad - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}l} \epsilon^{pq} (\Gamma_q)_{ab} \left(\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a \widehat{\gamma}_\beta \widehat{\epsilon}^b - \widehat{\psi}_\beta^a \widehat{\gamma}_\alpha \widehat{\epsilon}^b + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \widehat{\chi}^a \widehat{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\epsilon}^b \right), \\
\delta \widehat{\phi} &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \widehat{\chi}^a \widehat{\epsilon}_a, \\
\delta \widehat{\psi}_{\alpha a} &= \widehat{D}_\alpha \widehat{\epsilon}_a + \frac{1}{2l} \widehat{\gamma}_\alpha (\Gamma_{45})_{ab} \widehat{\epsilon}^b \\
&\quad - \frac{l}{6\sqrt{2}} \left(\widehat{\gamma}_\alpha^{\beta\delta} - 4\delta_\alpha^\beta \widehat{\gamma}^\delta \right) \left[\widehat{W}_{\beta\delta}^I (\Gamma_I)_{ab} + \frac{1}{l} \widehat{B}_{\beta\delta}^p (\Gamma_p)_{ab} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Omega_{ab} \widehat{F}_{\beta\delta} \right] \widehat{\epsilon}^b, \\
\delta \widehat{\chi}_a &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \widehat{\gamma}^\alpha \partial_\alpha \widehat{\phi} \widehat{\epsilon}_a - \frac{l}{2\sqrt{6}} \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \left[\widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^I (\Gamma_I)_{ab} + \frac{1}{l} \widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p (\Gamma_p)_{ab} - \sqrt{2} \Omega_{ab} \widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \right] \widehat{\epsilon}^b. \tag{88}
\end{aligned}$$

The linearized equations of motion for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauged supergravity multiplet $\Phi = (\widehat{e}_\alpha^m, \widehat{W}_\alpha^I, \widehat{A}_\alpha, \widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p, \phi, \widehat{\psi}_{\alpha a}, \widehat{\chi}_a)$ are the Einstein equation and the following equations,

$$\widehat{e}^{-1} \partial_\alpha (\widehat{g}^{\alpha\delta} \partial_\delta \widehat{W}_\beta^I) = 0; \tag{89}$$

$$\widehat{e}^{-1} \partial_\alpha (\widehat{g}^{\alpha\delta} \partial_\delta \widehat{A}_\beta) = 0; \tag{90}$$

$$\widehat{e}^{-1} \partial_\alpha \left(\widehat{e} \widehat{g}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta \widehat{\phi} \right) - \frac{\partial P(\widehat{\phi})}{\partial \widehat{\phi}} = 0; \tag{91}$$

$$\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p = \frac{3l}{2} \widehat{e} \epsilon^{pq} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma} \widehat{D}^{[\gamma} \widehat{B}^{\delta\sigma]}_q = \frac{3l}{2} \epsilon^{pq} \widehat{e} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma} \widehat{g}^{\gamma\gamma'} \widehat{g}^{\delta\delta'} \widehat{g}^{\sigma\sigma'} \widehat{D}_{[\gamma'} \widehat{B}_{\delta'\sigma']}_q; \tag{92}$$

$$\widehat{\gamma}^\alpha \widehat{D}_\alpha \widehat{\chi}_a + \frac{1}{2} (\Gamma_{45})_{ab} \widehat{\chi}^b = 0; \tag{93}$$

$$\widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \widehat{D}_\beta \widehat{\psi}_{\delta a} - \frac{3}{2l} (\Gamma_{45})_{ab} \Omega^{bc} \widehat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\psi}_{\beta c} = 0. \tag{94}$$

The following task is to find the solutions to these equations which asymptotically approach AdS_5 vacuum at $r \rightarrow 0$. A detailed process of solving these linearized equations is displayed in Ref. [87]. As in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ case, the gauge choices in radial direction and the solutions to above equations *near AdS_5 boundary* take the following forms [87],

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{e}_\mu^s(x, r) &\sim \frac{l}{r} e_\mu^s(x), \quad \widehat{e}_4^r = \widehat{e}_\mu^4 = 0, \quad \widehat{e}_4^4 = \frac{l}{r}; \\
\widehat{A}_\mu(x, r) &\sim A_\mu(x), \quad A_4(x, r) = 0;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{W}_\mu^I(x, r) &\sim W_\mu(x), \quad W_4^I(x, r) = 0; \\
\widehat{\phi}(x, r) &\sim \left(\frac{r}{l}\right)^2 \phi(x); \\
\widehat{B}_{\mu\nu}^p(x, r) &\sim \left(\frac{r}{l}\right)^{-1/3} B_{\mu\nu}^-(x); \\
\widehat{\chi}^a(x, r) &\sim \left(\frac{r}{l}\right)^{3/2} \chi^i(x); \\
\widehat{\psi}_\mu^a(x, r) &\sim \left(\frac{r}{l}\right)^{-1/2} \psi_\mu^i(x), \quad \widehat{\psi}_4^a(x, r) = 0;
\end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

In above equation we need to make some explanations on near- AdS_5 boundary behaviors of antisymmetric field $\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p$ and fermionic fields χ^a, ψ_α^a [87]. First, we define

$$\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^4 - i \widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^5 \right). \tag{96}$$

This is actually converting the $SO(2)$ vector representation on $\widehat{B}_{\mu\nu}^p$ into $U(1)$ representation on $\widehat{B}_{\mu\nu}$. Further, we decompose $\widehat{B}_{\mu\nu}$ into self-dual and anti-self-dual sectors,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{B}_{\mu\nu}^\pm &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\widehat{B}_{\mu\nu} \pm \widetilde{\widehat{B}}_{\mu\nu} \right); \\
\widetilde{\widehat{B}}_{\mu\nu} &= \frac{1}{2} \widehat{e} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \widehat{g}^{\lambda\sigma} \widehat{g}^{\rho\delta} \widehat{B}^{\lambda\delta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

$\widehat{B}_{4\mu}^p$ is not an independent quantity and its relation with $\widehat{B}_{\mu\nu}^p$ is given by $(\tau\mu)$ component of Eq. (92).

$$\widehat{B}_{\tau\mu}^p = \frac{3r}{2l} e \epsilon^{pq} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} g^{\nu\sigma} g^{\lambda\delta} g^{\rho\xi} D_{[\sigma} \widehat{B}_{\delta\xi]q}. \tag{98}$$

This equation also shows that the radial coordinate dependence $\widehat{B}_{\tau\mu}^p$ is one power higher than $\widehat{B}_{\mu\nu}^p$.

As for the near- AdS_5 boundary behavior of on-shell fermionic fields ψ_μ^a and χ^a , they are in the fundamental representation of $USp(4)$. According to Eq. (78), these fermions should decompose into two $SU(2)$ doublets with opposite $U(1)$ charges. We choose following explicit representations of Γ -matrices for the five-dimensional Euclidean Clifford algebra (73) [87],

$$\Gamma^1 = 1 \otimes \sigma_1, \quad \Gamma^2 = 1 \otimes \sigma_2, \quad \Gamma^3 = \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_3, \quad \Gamma^4 = \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_3, \quad \Gamma^5 = \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_3, \tag{99}$$

and hence obtain the representation for $SU(2) \times U(1)$ generators,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q &= -\frac{i}{2} \Gamma^{45} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_3 \otimes 1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/2 \end{pmatrix}, \\
T^I &= -\frac{i}{2} \Gamma^{I45}, \\
T^1 &= \frac{1}{2} \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_1, \quad T^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_2, \quad T^3 = \frac{1}{2} 1 \otimes \sigma_3 \\
[Q, T^I] &= 0, \quad [T^I, T^J] = i \epsilon^{IJK} T^K.
\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

These explicit representations for $SU(2) \times U(1)$ generators determines that the first two components of Ψ_a in the fundamental representation of $USp(4)$ should be chosen as the $SU(2)$ doublet with $U(1)$ charge $+1/2$ and the last two components as the doublet of $U(1)$ charge $-1/2$ [87],

$$(\Psi_a) = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_3 \\ \Psi_4 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_i \\ \Psi^i \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\Psi_i) = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\Psi^i) = (\Psi_i^*) = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_3 \\ \Psi_4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (101)$$

In above equation, Ψ_a represents either $\hat{\psi}_\mu^a$ or $\hat{\chi}^a$. Therefore, the equation of motion (93) ((94) for $\hat{\chi}^a$ ($\hat{\psi}_\mu^a$) reduces to that for $\hat{\psi}_\mu^i$ ($\hat{\chi}^i$). Further, like in the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ case, we perform chiral decomposition on the four-dimensional spinors $\hat{\psi}_\mu^i$ and $\hat{\chi}^i$ and the corresponding reductions of equations of motion on chiral spinors give the asymptotical behaviors of fermionic fields shown in Eq. (95). Note that $\psi_\mu^i(x)$ ($\chi^i(x)$) is $SU(2)$ symplectic Majorana spinors constructed from the right-handed spinor $\psi_\mu^{Ri}(x)$ ($\chi^{Ri}(x)$). The near- AdS_5 boundary behavior of the left-handed spinor $\hat{\psi}_\mu^{Li}(x)$ ($\hat{\chi}^{Li}(x)$) is not independent, and it can be expressed in terms of the right-handed spinor $\psi_\mu^{Ri}(x)$ ($\chi^{Ri}(x)$) [87]. Substituting Eq. (95) into the supersymmetry transformation law (88) and making the same operation on the supersymmetry transformation parameter $\hat{\epsilon}^a$ as $\hat{\chi}^a$, we obtain the reduction of bulk supersymmetry transformation on AdS_5 boundary up to the leading order of fermionic fields [87],

$$\begin{aligned} \delta e_\mu^s &= \frac{1}{2} \bar{\epsilon}^i \gamma^s \psi_{\mu i}, \\ \delta \psi_\mu^i &= D_\mu \epsilon^i - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{\nu\rho} B_{\nu\rho}^- \gamma_\mu \epsilon^i - \gamma_\mu \eta^i, \\ \delta W_{\mu j}^i &= \left(-\bar{\zeta}_\mu^i \gamma_5 \epsilon_j + \frac{1}{2} \delta_j^i \bar{\xi}_\mu^k \gamma_5 \epsilon_k - \bar{\psi}^i \gamma_5 \eta_j + \frac{1}{2} \delta_j^i \bar{\psi}_\mu^k \gamma_5 \eta_k \right), \\ \delta A_\mu &= -i \bar{\zeta}_\mu^i \gamma_5 \epsilon_i + i \bar{\psi}_\mu^i \gamma_5 \eta_i, \\ \delta \phi &= \frac{1}{2} \bar{\epsilon}^i \chi_i, \\ \delta B_{\mu\nu}^- &= \bar{\epsilon}^i R_{\mu\nu i} [Q] + \bar{\epsilon}^i \gamma_{\mu\nu} \chi_i, \\ \delta \chi_i &= \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \phi \epsilon_i + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu}^- \epsilon_i. \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

where ξ_μ^i and the curvature $R_{\mu\nu}^i [Q]$ corresponding to local supersymmetry are defined as the following,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\mu\nu i} [Q] &= D_\mu \psi_{\nu i} - D_\nu \psi_{\mu i} - (\gamma_\mu \psi_{\nu i} - \gamma_\nu \psi_{\mu i}), \\ \xi_\mu^i &= \frac{1}{3} \gamma^\nu \left(D_\nu \psi_\mu^i - D_\mu \psi_\nu^i + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_5 \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} D^\lambda \psi^{i\rho} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

Eq. (102) is exactly the supersymmetry transformation law $\mathcal{N} = 2$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions. Further, we find that the bulk diffeomorphism transformation law of the on-shell field on AdS_5 boundary reduces to the four-dimensional diffeomorphism and Weyl transformations and that the bulk $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge transformations on AdS_5

boundary convert into the axial $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge transformation. These reductions of symmetry transformations determine that the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ five-dimensional $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauged supergravity near its AdS_5 vacuum configuration behaves like the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ off-shell conformal supergravity in four dimensions. The matching of degrees of freedom between on-shell multiplet $(\widehat{e}_\alpha^m, \widehat{W}_\alpha^I, \widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^p, \widehat{A}_\alpha, \widehat{\phi}, \widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a, \widehat{\chi}^a)$ of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity and off-shell multiplet $(e_\mu^r, W_\mu^I, A_\mu, \phi, B_{\mu\nu}^-, \psi_\mu^i, \chi^i)$ of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions is listed in Table II.

D. On-shell $\mathcal{N} = 8$ $SO(6)$ Gauged AdS_5 Supergravity and Off-shell $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Conformal Supergravity in Four Dimensions

In this subsection, we review $\mathcal{N} = 8$ $SO(6)$ gauged supergravity in five dimensions and argue that its classical dynamical behavior near AdS_5 vacuum configuration leads to $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions.

The ungauged $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity in five dimensions can be obtained from the dimensional reduction of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity in eleven dimensions [64,65]. It has global $E_{6(6)}$ symmetry and local $USp(8)$ R -symmetry. If counted in terms of the representation of $USp(8)$ R -symmetry group, the field content consists of 1 graviton $\widehat{e}_\alpha^m$, 8 gravitini $\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a$, 27 vector fields $\widehat{A}_\alpha^{ab}$, 48 spin-1/2 fields $\widehat{\chi}^{abc}$ and 42 scalar fields $\widehat{\phi}^{abcd}$, $\alpha = 0, \dots, 4$ and $m = 0, \dots, 4$ denote the five-dimensional space-time and local $SO(1, 5)$ Lorentz indices, respectively, and $a, b, c, d = 1, \dots, 8$ label fundamental representation indices of $USp(8)$. The above particle spectrum can also be viewed from the representation of the global $E_{6(6)}$ group by introducing a 27-bein V_{AB}^{ab} , $A, B = 1, \dots, 8$, which is an element of the coset group $E_{6(6)}/USp(8)$ and furnishes both the 27-dimensional vector representation of $USp(8)$ and the fundamental representation of $E_{6(6)}$. According to this viewpoint the spinor fields $\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^a$ and $\widehat{\chi}^{abc}$ still behave as the $USp(8)$ tensors, but those 27 $USp(8)$ vector fields $\widehat{A}_\alpha^{ab}$ should be considered as in the fundamental representation of $E_{6(6)}$ with the identification $A_\mu^{AB} = \widetilde{V}_{ab}^{AB} A_\mu^{ab}$. $\widetilde{V}_{ab}^{AB}$ is the inverse of V_{AB}^{ab} , it furnishes the conjugate representation $\overline{27}$ of $E_{6(6)}$ and satisfies the following relation,

$$\widetilde{V}_{ab}^{AB} V_{AB}^{cd} = \frac{1}{2} (\delta_a^c \delta_b^d - \delta_a^d \delta_b^c) + \frac{1}{8} \Omega_{ab} \Omega^{cd}, \quad (104)$$

where Ω_{ab} and Ω^{ab} are the symplectic metric of $USp(8)$ and its inverse, respectively. The 42 scalar fields $\widehat{\phi}^{abcd}$ parameterize the non-compact coset space $E_{6(6)}/USp(8)$ since E_6 and $USp(8)$ have 78 and 36 generators, respectively. Based on this observation, one can replace these scalar fields $\widehat{\phi}^{abcd}$ by $\widetilde{V}_{ab}^{AB}$ or equivalently by vector fields $P_{\alpha abcd}$ defined by

$$\widetilde{V}_{cd}^{AB} \partial_\alpha V_{AB}^{ab} = 2Q_{\alpha[c}^{[a} \delta_{d]}^{b]} + P_{acd}^{ab}. \quad (105)$$

$Q_{\alpha a}^b$ are $USp(8)$ Lie algebra valued and transform as gauge fields of $USp(8)$, and $P_{\alpha abcd}$ are in the 42-dimensional representation $USp(8)$ exactly like scalar fields $\widehat{\phi}^{abc}$. The above process is actually furnishing field function representation to E_6 group through its maximal subgroup $USp(8)$.

The Lagrangian density for the ungauged $\mathcal{N} = 8$ Poincaré supergravity in five dimensions can thus be constructed based on the global $E_{6(6)}$ and local $USp(8)$ symmetries as well as the $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supersymmetry [64,65],

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{e}^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\text{ungauged}} = & -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2}\hat{R}[\hat{\omega}] - \frac{1}{2}i\bar{\psi}_\alpha\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta}\hat{\nabla}_\alpha\hat{\psi}_{\delta a} - \frac{1}{8}G_{AB,CD}\hat{F}_{\alpha\beta}^{AB}\hat{F}^{\alpha\beta CD} + \frac{1}{12}i\bar{\chi}^{abc}\hat{\gamma}^\alpha\hat{\nabla}_\alpha\chi_{abc} \\
& - \frac{1}{24\kappa^2}P_{\alpha bcd}P^{\alpha bcd} - \frac{1}{12}\hat{e}^{-1}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma}\hat{F}_{\alpha\beta}{}^A{}_B\hat{F}_{\gamma\delta}{}^B{}_C\hat{A}_\sigma{}^C{}_A + \frac{i}{3\sqrt{2}}P_{\alpha bcd}\bar{\psi}_\beta\hat{\gamma}^\alpha\hat{\gamma}^\beta\chi^{bcd} \\
& + \frac{1}{4}i\kappa V_{AB}{}^{ab}\hat{F}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{AB}\left(\bar{\psi}_a\hat{\gamma}_{[\delta}\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{\gamma}_{\sigma]}\hat{\psi}_b^\sigma + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\bar{\psi}_\delta\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{\gamma}^\delta\hat{\chi}_{abc} + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\chi}_{acd}\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{\chi}_b{}^{cd}\right) \\
& + \text{four-fermion terms},
\end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

where $\hat{F}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{AB}$ is the field strength corresponding to the vector field $A_\alpha{}^{AB}$,

$$\hat{F}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{AB} = \partial_\alpha\hat{A}_\beta{}^{AB} - \partial_\beta\hat{A}_\alpha{}^{AB} + [\hat{A}_\alpha, \hat{A}_\beta]^{AB}; \tag{107}$$

$G_{AB,CD}$ is $E_{6(6)}$ covariant and $USp(8)$ invariant metric,

$$G_{AB,CD} = V_{AB}{}^{ab}\Omega_{ac}\Omega_{bd}V_{CD}{}^{cd}; \tag{108}$$

The covariant derivative $\hat{\nabla}_\alpha$ acting on spinor fields is defined with respect to both spin connection $\hat{\omega}_\alpha$ and $USp(8)$ gauge field $Q_\alpha{}^a{}_b$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\nabla}_\alpha\hat{\psi}_\beta^a &= \left(\partial_\alpha\delta_b^a - Q_\alpha{}^a{}_b + \frac{1}{4}\hat{\omega}_{\alpha mn}\hat{\gamma}^{mn}\delta_b^a\right)\hat{\psi}_\beta^b, \\
\hat{\nabla}_\alpha\hat{\chi}^{abc} &= \left(\partial_\alpha\delta^{[a}{}_d - 3Q_\mu{}^{[a}{}_d + \frac{1}{4}\hat{\omega}_{\alpha mn}\hat{\gamma}^{mn}\delta^{[a}{}_d\right)\hat{\chi}^{dbc]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{109}$$

The gauging of above supergravity is just turning some of the 27 vector fields $A_\alpha{}^{AB}$ into gauge fields of certain simple subgroup of $E_{6(6)}$ [66]. That is, the global symmetry group of $E_{(6)}$ in the ungauged $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity should break to the gauge group. It is obvious that one cannot convert all of those 27 vector fields into gauge fields since there exists no simple group with 27 generators. Thus the gauge group should be a subgroup of $E_{6(6)}$ with dimensionality less than 27. This determines that the possible gauge group should be $SO(6)$ and its noncompact real forms $SO(n, 6-n)$, $1 < n \leq 3$. This is because $SO(n, 6-n)$, $(0 \leq n \leq 3)$ are all subgroups of $SL(6, R)$, while $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ is the maximal subgroup of $E_{6(6)}$. To complete this gauging procedure, one should first rearrange above field representations of $E_{6(6)}$ in terms of the representations realized on its maximal subgroup $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$. That is, we branch $E_{6(6)}$ with respect to $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$. As a consequence, the vector fields $\hat{A}_\alpha{}^{AB}$, the 27-bein $V_{AB}{}^{ab}$ and its inverse $V_{ab}{}^{AB}$, all of which are in the 27- or $\overline{27}$ -dimensional fundamental representation $E_{6(6)}$, decompose as

$$\begin{aligned}
27 &= (\overline{15}, 1) \oplus (6, 2), \quad \overline{27} = (15, 1) \oplus (\overline{6}, \overline{2}), \\
\hat{A}_\alpha{}^{AB} &= \begin{pmatrix} \hat{A}_{\alpha IJ} \\ \hat{A}_{\alpha}{}^{Kp} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{A}_{\alpha IJ} = -\hat{A}_{\alpha JI}; \\
V_{AB}{}^{ab} &= (V^{IJab}, V_{Ip}{}^{ab}), \quad \tilde{V}^{AB}{}_{ab} = (\tilde{V}_{IJab}, \tilde{V}^{Ip}{}_{ab}),
\end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

and there exist that

$$V^{IJab}\tilde{V}_{abKL} = \delta^{IJ}{}_{KL}, \quad V_{Jq}{}^{ab}\tilde{V}_{ab}{}^{Ip} = \delta^I{}_J\delta^p{}_q, \quad V_{KL}{}^{ab}\tilde{V}_{ab}{}^{Ip} = V_{Ipab}\tilde{V}_{abIJ} = 0. \tag{111}$$

In above equations, $I, J, K = 1, \dots, 6$ and $p = 1, 2$ are the fundamental representation indices of $SL(6, R)$ and $SL(2, R)$, respectively. The vector fields $\hat{A}_{\alpha IJ}$ naturally become gauge fields for $SO(n, 6-n)$ group. For any quantity X_{aI} which used to transform with respect to certain representation of the global $SL(6, R)$ and local $USp(8)$ in the ungauged theory, the covariant derivative is defined as

$$\widehat{D}_\alpha \widehat{X}_{aI} \equiv \partial_\alpha \widehat{X}_{aI} + Q_{\alpha a}{}^b \widehat{X}_{bI} - g \widehat{A}_{\alpha IJ} \eta^{JK} \widehat{X}_{aK}. \quad (112)$$

However, the remained 12 vector fields $\hat{A}_\alpha^{Ip}$ transform nontrivially under the gauge group $SO(n, 6-n)$. To keep these 12 vector fields massless, one must replace them by its Hodge dual, the second-rank antisymmetric field $\hat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^{Ip}$ and specifically $\hat{B}_{\alpha\beta}$ should satisfy the following self-dual field equation,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{B}^{Ip} &= c \star \hat{G}^{Ip}, \\ \hat{B}^{Ip} &= \frac{1}{2} \hat{B}_{\alpha\beta}^{Ip} dx^\alpha \wedge dx^\beta, \\ \hat{G} &= d\hat{B}, \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

where c is certain constant. The Abelian symmetry $\hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{B} + d\hat{\Lambda}$ prevents $\hat{B}_\alpha^{Ip}$ from becoming massive.

The gravitational field $\hat{e}_\alpha^m$ keeps intact since it is an $E_{6(6)}$ singlet. In the following, let us turn to the conversion of the 42 scalar fields in the gauging process. As stated above, these scalar fields parametrize the non-compact space $E_{(6)}/USp(8)$ and are described by 27-bein $V_{AB}{}^{cd}$ or its inverse $\tilde{V}_{ab}{}^{AB}$. Since $V_{AB}{}^{cd}$ (or $\tilde{V}_{ab}{}^{AB}$) transforms as $\overline{27}$ (or 27) under $E_{(6)}$ and $\overline{27}$ (27) under $USp(8)$, it should be branched with respect to $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ as shown in Eq. (110). To keep $E_{(6)}/USp(8)$ coset space structure for scalar fields as that in the ungauged case, one just simply generalizes Eq. (105) in a gauge covariant way and defines P_α^{abcd} as the covariant derivative of the 27-bein with respect to $SO(n, 6-n)$ gauge fields $\hat{A}_\alpha^{IJ}$ and $USp(8)$ connection,

$$\tilde{V}^{abAB} D_\alpha V_{AB}{}^{cd} = P_\alpha^{abcd} \equiv P_\alpha^{[abcd]}. \quad (114)$$

These definitions determine that in the gauged case the $USp(8)$ connection $Q_{\alpha a}{}^b$ can be expressed in terms of the 27-bein and $SO(n, 6-n)$ gauge fields,

$$Q_{\alpha a}{}^b = -\frac{1}{3} \left[\tilde{V}^{bcAB} \partial_\alpha V_{ABac} + g A_{\alpha IK} \eta^{JK} \left(2V_{ac}{}^{IL} \tilde{V}^{bc}{}_{JL} - V_{Jpac} \tilde{V}^{bcIp} \right) \right] \quad (115)$$

The Lagrangian density of five-dimensional $SO(n, 6-n)$ gauged $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity takes the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{e}^{-1} \mathcal{L} &= -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2} \widehat{R}[\widehat{\omega}] - \frac{1}{2} i \overline{\hat{\psi}}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \widehat{D}_\beta \hat{\psi}_{\delta a} + \frac{1}{12} i \overline{\hat{\chi}}^{\alpha bc} \hat{\gamma}^\alpha \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \hat{\chi}_{abc} - \frac{1}{24} P_{\alpha abcd} P^{\alpha abcd} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{8} \left(\widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta ab} + \widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta ab} \right) \left(\widehat{F}^{\alpha\beta ab} + \widehat{B}^{\alpha\beta ab} \right) + \frac{i}{3\sqrt{2}} P_{\beta abcd} \overline{\hat{\psi}}_\alpha^a \hat{\gamma}^\beta \hat{\gamma}^\alpha \hat{\chi}^{bcd} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} i \kappa \left(\widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{ab} + \widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{ab} \right) \left(\overline{\hat{\psi}}_a \hat{\gamma}_{[\delta} \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\gamma}_{\sigma]} \hat{\psi}_b^\sigma + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \overline{\hat{\psi}}_\delta \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\gamma}^\delta \hat{\chi}_{abc} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{\hat{\chi}}_{acd} \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\chi}_b{}^{cd} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{15}igT_{ab}\overline{\psi}_\alpha\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{\psi}_\beta^b + \frac{i}{6\sqrt{2}}gA_{abcd}\overline{\chi}^{abc}\hat{\gamma}^\alpha\hat{\psi}_\alpha^d + \frac{1}{2}ig\overline{\chi}^{abc}\left(\frac{1}{2}A_{bcde} - \frac{1}{45}\Omega_{bd}T_{ce}\right)\hat{\chi}_a^{de} \\
& + \frac{1}{96}g^2\left[\left(\frac{8}{15}\right)^2(T_{ab})^2 - (A_{abcd})^2\right] + \frac{1}{8g}\hat{e}^{-1}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma}\eta_{IJ}\epsilon_{pq}\hat{B}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{Ip}\hat{D}_\gamma\hat{B}_{\delta\sigma}{}^{Jq} \\
& - \frac{1}{96}e^{-1}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma}\epsilon^{IJKLMN}\left(\hat{F}_{IJ\alpha\beta}\hat{F}_{KL\gamma\delta}\hat{A}_{MN\sigma} + g\eta^{PQ}\hat{F}_{IJ\alpha\beta}\hat{A}_{KL\gamma}\hat{A}_{MP\delta}\hat{A}_{QN\sigma}\right. \\
& \left. + \frac{2}{5}g^2\eta^{PQ}\eta^{RS}\hat{A}_{IJ\alpha}\hat{A}_{KP\beta}\hat{A}_{QL\gamma}\hat{A}_{MR\delta}\hat{A}_{QN\sigma}\right) + \text{four-fermion terms.} \tag{116}
\end{aligned}$$

In above Lagrangian, the $SO(n, 6-n)$ gauge field strength $\hat{F}_{\alpha\beta IJ}$ and antisymmetric field $\hat{B}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{ab}$ are defined as the following,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{F}_{\alpha\beta IJ} &= \partial_\alpha\hat{A}_{\beta IJ} - \partial_\beta\hat{A}_{\alpha IJ} - g[\hat{A}_\alpha, \hat{A}_\beta]_{IJ}, \\
\hat{F}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{ab} &= \hat{F}_{\alpha\beta IJ}V^{IJab}, \quad \hat{B}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{ab} = \hat{B}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{Ip}V_{Ip}{}^{ab}. \tag{117}
\end{aligned}$$

The $USp(8)$ tensors T , A and the relevant W are all constructed from the $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ components of 27-bein $V_{AB}{}^{ab}$ and its inverse $\tilde{V}_{ab}{}^{AB}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{bcd}^a &\equiv \left(2V^{IKae}\tilde{V}_{beJK} - V_{Jp}{}^{ae}\tilde{V}_{be}{}^{Ip}\right)\eta^{JL}\tilde{V}_{cdIL}, \\
W_{abcd} &\equiv \epsilon^{pq}\eta^{IJ}V_{Ipab}V_{Jqcd} = -W_{cdab}, \quad A_{abcd} \equiv T_{a[bcd]} \\
T_{abcd} &= \Omega_{ae}T_{bcd}^e = T_{bacd}, \quad T_{ab} \equiv T_{ab}^c. \tag{118}
\end{aligned}$$

The above $USp(8)$ tensors satisfy the following relations and identities originating from their definitions,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{ab} &= T_{ba} = \frac{15}{4}W_{acb}^c, \\
W_{abcd} &= \frac{1}{6}(T_{acbd} - T_{bcad} + T_{bdac} - T_{adbc}) + \frac{1}{5}(\Omega_{a[c}T_{d]b} - \Omega_{b[c}T_{d]a}), \\
A_{abcd} &= -3W_{a[bcd]}, \quad A_{[abcd]} = 0, \\
T_{abcd}W_{ef}^{cd} &= 0, \quad A_{bcd}^eW_{a]efg} = 0, \\
9A_{cde}^cA_{cdeb} - \frac{8}{5}T^{cd}A_{cdab} - (A_a{}^{cde}A_{bcde} + \Omega_{ab}A^{cdef}A_{cdef}) &= 0, \\
\frac{6}{(45)^2}T_{ac}T_b{}^c - \frac{1}{96}A_{cde}A_b{}^{cde} &= -\frac{1}{8}\Omega_{ab}\left[\frac{6}{(45)^2}T_{cd}T^{cd} - \frac{1}{96}A_{cdef}A^{cdef}\right]. \tag{119}
\end{aligned}$$

These identities play some roles in proving the supersymmetric invariance of gauged supergravity.

The supersymmetry transformation laws at the leading order of fermionic fields are

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\hat{e}_\alpha{}^m &= -i\tilde{\epsilon}^a\hat{\gamma}^m\hat{\psi}_{\alpha a}, \\
\delta\hat{A}_{\alpha IJ} &= 2i\left(\tilde{\epsilon}^a\hat{\psi}_\alpha^b + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\tilde{\epsilon}_c\hat{\gamma}_\alpha\hat{\chi}^{abc}\right)\tilde{V}_{abIJ}, \\
\delta\hat{B}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{Ip} &= 2D_{[\alpha}\left[2i\left(\tilde{\epsilon}^a\hat{\psi}_{\beta]}^b + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\tilde{\epsilon}_c\hat{\gamma}_{\beta]}^b\hat{\chi}^{abc}\right)\tilde{V}_{ab}{}^{Ip}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2ig\eta^{IJ}\epsilon^{pq}V_{Jqab}\left(\bar{\psi}_{[\alpha}\hat{\gamma}_{\beta]}\hat{\epsilon}^b+\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}\bar{\chi}^{abc}\hat{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta}\hat{\epsilon}_c\right), \\
& \delta\hat{\psi}_{\alpha a}=\widehat{D}_{\alpha}\hat{\epsilon}_a-\frac{2}{45}gT_{ab}\hat{\gamma}_{\alpha}\hat{\epsilon}^b-\frac{1}{6}\left(\widehat{F}_{\beta\delta ab}+\widehat{B}_{\beta\delta ab}\right)\left(\hat{\gamma}^{\beta\sigma}\hat{\gamma}_{\alpha}+2\hat{\gamma}^{\beta}\delta^{\sigma}_{\alpha}\right)\hat{\epsilon}^b, \\
& \delta\hat{\chi}_{abc}=\sqrt{2}\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha}P_{\alpha abcd}\hat{\epsilon}^d-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}g\hat{\epsilon}^dA_{dabc}-\frac{3}{2\sqrt{2}}\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\left(\widehat{F}_{\alpha\beta[ab}+\widehat{B}_{\alpha\beta[ab}\right)\hat{\epsilon}_{c]}, \\
& \left(\frac{\delta V^{IJab}}{\delta V_{I\alpha}{}^{ab}}\right)=-2\sqrt{2}i\left(\frac{V^{IJ}{}_{cd}}{V_{I\alpha cd}}\right)\bar{\epsilon}^{[a}\hat{\chi}^{bcd]}
\end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

It was found in Ref. [66] that when the gauge group is $SO(6)$ this gauged supergravity admits AdS_5 classical solution which preserves the full $\mathcal{N}=8$ supersymmetry (or equivalent speaking, a classical solution exhibiting $\mathcal{N}=4$ anti-de Sitter supersymmetry $SU(2,2|4)$) [66,68,67]. The existence of this solution can be explained as the following [66,68,67]. Considering a configuration of above gauged supergravity with only nonvanishing metric and scalar field, one has the Einstein equation from the action (116),

$$\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}-\frac{1}{2}\hat{g}_{\alpha\beta}\hat{R}=2P\hat{g}_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{121}$$

In above equation, P is the scalar potential in (116), which be rewritten as the following form with the T -tensor identities,

$$\begin{aligned}
P &= -g^2\left[\frac{6}{(45)^2}T_{ab}T^{ab}-\frac{1}{96}A_{abcd}A^{abcd}\right] \\
&= -\frac{1}{32}g^2\left[2W_{ab}W^{ab}-W_{abcd}W^{abcd}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{122}$$

Eq. (121) shows that if the the scalar potential has a critical point at certain expectation value of the scalar field, and the corresponding critical value of the scalar potential $P_0 < 0$, the AdS_5 solution exists with the cosmological constant $\Lambda = -4/3P_0$.

To verify explicitly the existence of such a critical point one has to re-express the scalar potential in an $SO(n, 6-n)$ gauge invariant form. So W_{ab} and W_{abcd} in the scalar potential should be rewritten in terms of the representations of $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ because it is the subgroup of $SL(6, R)$ that is gauged. Since W_{ab} and W_{abcd} are tensors of $USp(8)$ group, the maximal compact subgroup of of $E_{6(6)}$, while $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ is the maximal subgroup of $E_{6(6)}$, one should establish an explicit connection between the representations of $USp(8)$ and of $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$. This can be done by working out the explicit forms for the $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ components of the 27-bein, $V_{AB}{}^{ab} = (V^{IJab}, V_{Ip}{}^{ab})$. The method is employing the representation of $USp(8)$ generators constructed from $SO(7)$ Clifford algebra and the transformation law of the $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ components of 27-dimensional basis $Z^{AB} = (Z_{IJ}, Z^{Ip}/\sqrt{2})$ under $E_{6(6)}$ action. This can be proceeded as the following. First, with $SO(7)$ gamma matrices Γ_i , $i = 0, I$, $I = 1, \dots, 6$, $\{\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j\} = 2\delta_{ij}$, the representation of generators of $USp(8)$ expressed in terms of its $SU(4) \times U(1)$ subalgebra is

$$(A_{IJ})_a{}^b = (\Gamma_{IJ})^{ab}, \quad (A)_a{}^b = (\Gamma_0)^{ab}, \quad (S_{IJK})^{ab} = (\Gamma_{IJK})^{ab} = (\Gamma_{IJK})^{ab}, \tag{123}$$

A_{IJ} and A are generators of $SU(4) \times U(1)$. Using the following defined Γ -matrices,

$$\Gamma_{Ip} = (\Gamma_I, i\Gamma_I\Gamma_0) \quad (124)$$

and above $SU(4)$ generators, one can obtain the $USp(8)$ components Z^{ab} of the 27-dimensional bases Z^{AB} of $E_{(6)6}$ with the projection coefficients being the $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ components (Z_{IJ}, Z^{Ip}) ,

$$Z^{ab} = \frac{1}{4} (\Gamma^{IJ})^{ab} Z_{IJ} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} (\Gamma_{Ip})^{ab} Z^{Ip} = Z^{AB} V_{AB}{}^{ab}. \quad (125)$$

The invariant inner product

$$\tilde{Z}_{ab} Z^{ab} = \tilde{Z}_{AB} Z^{AB} = \tilde{Z}^{IJ} Z_{IJ} + \tilde{Z}_{Ip} Z^{Ip} \quad (126)$$

determines the projection $\tilde{Z}_{ab}$ in the $USp(8)$ representation space of dual bases $\tilde{Z}_{AB}$,

$$\tilde{Z}_{ab} = \frac{1}{4} (\Gamma_{IJ})^{ab} \tilde{Z}^{IJ} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} (\Gamma^{Ip})^{AB} \tilde{Z}_{Ip} = V_{ab}{}^{AB} \tilde{Z}_{AB}. \quad (127)$$

where $\tilde{Z}_{IJ}$ and $\tilde{Z}^{Ip}$ are dual bases in $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ conjugate representation spaces.

On the other hand, as a fundamental representation of $E_{6(6)}$, the infinitesimal transformations of Z^{AB} under the action of $E_{6(6)}$ read

$$\delta \left(\begin{array}{c} Z_{IJ} \\ Z^{K\alpha}/\sqrt{2} \end{array} \right) = X \left(\begin{array}{c} Z_{MN} \\ Z^{P\beta}/\sqrt{2} \end{array} \right). \quad (128)$$

The X in above equation is the 27×27 matrix,

$$X = \left(\begin{array}{cc} -4\lambda_{[I}^{[M} \delta_{J]}^N & \sqrt{2}\Sigma_{IJP\beta} \\ \sqrt{2}\Sigma^{MNK\alpha} & \Lambda_{K_P}^{\alpha} \delta_{\beta}^K + \delta_{K_P}^{\alpha} \Lambda_{\beta}^K \end{array} \right); \quad (129)$$

$\Lambda_{K_P}^K$ and Λ_{β}^{α} are $SL(6, R)$ and $SL(2, R)$ Lie algebra valued infinitesimal matrices, respectively, and Σ_{MNKp} is a real and antisymmetric self-dual tensor of $SL(6, R)$, $\Sigma^{MNKp} = \Sigma^{[MNK]p} = 1/3! \epsilon^{pq} \epsilon^{IJKLMN} \Sigma_{LMNq}$. Eq. (128) implies the following finite transformation of Z^{AB} under the action of $E_{6(6)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} Z'_{IJ} &= \frac{1}{2} U_{IJ}{}^{MN} Z_{MN} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} Z^{Lq} U_{LqIJ}, \\ Z'^{Kp} &= Z^{Lq} U_{Lq}{}^{Kp} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} U^{KpIJ} Z_{IJ}, \\ U &\equiv \exp(X). \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

Eqs. (125) and (130) give the action of $E_{6(6)}$ on the $USp(8)$ components Z^{ab} of Z^{AB} ,

$$\begin{aligned} Z'^{ab} &= \left[\frac{1}{8} (\Gamma^{IJ})^{ab} U_{IJ}{}^{KL} + \frac{1}{4} (\Gamma_{Ip})^{ab} U^{IpKL} \right] Z_{KL} \\ &+ Z^{Kq} \left[\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} (\Gamma^{IJ})^{ab} U_{KqIJ} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} (\Gamma_{Ip})^{ab} U_{Kq}{}^{Ip} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

and hence yield the 27-bein expressed in terms of the fundamental representation (27×27) matrix of $E_{6(6)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} V^{KLab} &= \frac{1}{8} (\Gamma^{IJ})^{ab} U_{IJ}{}^{KL} + \frac{1}{4} (\Gamma_{Ip})^{ab} U^{IpKL}, \\ V_{Ip}{}^{ab} &= \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} (\Gamma^{MN})^{ab} U_{IpMN} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} (\Gamma_{Kq})^{ab} U_{Ip}{}^{Kq}. \end{aligned} \quad (132)$$

A substitution (132) into (118) and (122) converts the $USp(8)$ tensors in the scalar potential into the $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ tensors,

$$\begin{aligned} W^{ab} &= \frac{1}{8} i\epsilon^{pq} \eta^{IJ} \left\{ (\Gamma^{KL} \Gamma_0)^{ab} U_{IpKM} U_{JqLM} - i\delta_r{}^s (\Gamma_{[KL} \Gamma_{M]s})^{ab} U_{Ip}{}^{Mr} U_{JqKL} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \epsilon_{rs} U_{Ip}{}^{Kr} U_{Jq}{}^{Ls} [(\Gamma_{KL} \Gamma_0)^{ab} + i\delta^{ab}] \right\}; \\ W_{abcd} W^{abcd} &= \eta^{IK} \eta^{JL} \epsilon^{pr} \epsilon^{qs} M_{IpJq} M_{KrLs}; \\ M_{IpJq} &= (UU^T)_{IpJq} = \frac{1}{2} U_{Ip}{}^{KL} U_{JqKL} + U_{Ip}{}^{Kr} U_{JqKr}. \end{aligned} \quad (133)$$

Further, the scalar potential can be reduced to $SL(6, R)$ invariant form by choosing the cross components σ_{IJKp} to vanish. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} U^{IJ}{}_{KL} &= 2S_{[K}^{[I} S_{L]}^{J]}, \quad U^{IJKp} = U_{KpIJ} = 0, \quad U_{Ip}{}^{Jq} = S_I^J S_\alpha'^\beta, \\ (S_J^I) &\in SL(6, R), \quad (S_\alpha'^\beta) \in SL(2, R) \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

and $USp(8)$ tensor W_{ab} simplifies to

$$W_{ab} = -\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}(\eta M) \delta_{ab}, \quad (135)$$

where $M_{IJ} = (SS^T)_{IJ} = S_I^K S_{JK}$ is the symmetry $SL(6, R)$ metric. Consequently, the anticipated form of scalar potential (122) arises,

$$P = -\frac{1}{32} g^2 \left\{ [\text{Tr}(\eta M)]^2 - 2 [\text{Tr}(\eta M \eta M)] \right\}, \quad (136)$$

Since M is a symmetric matrix of $SL(6, R)$, one can always employ $SO(6)$ gauge symmetry to make M diagonal by its subgroup $SO(6)$ ($\det M = 1$),

$$M = \text{diag} \{ e^{2\lambda_1}, e^{2\lambda_2}, e^{2\lambda_3}, e^{2\lambda_4}, e^{2\lambda_5}, e^{2\lambda_6} \}, \quad \sum_{\lambda_i} \lambda_i = 0. \quad (137)$$

It was shown that only when all $\lambda_i = 0$, i.e., the gauge group is $SO(6)$, the AdS_5 vacuum configuration exists. According to Eq. (135), the critical points of scalar fields are

$$W_{ab} = -\frac{3}{2} \delta_{ab} = -\left(-\frac{3P_0}{g^2} \right)^{1/2} \delta_{ab} \quad (138)$$

and the cosmological constant comes from the critical value of the scalar potential,

$$\Lambda = -\frac{4}{3}P_0 = g^2. \quad (139)$$

The preservation on $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supersymmetry in this AdS_5 space-time background can be revealed by observing the Killing spinor equation obtained from the supersymmetric transformations for the fermionic fields $\hat{\psi}_\alpha^a$ and $\hat{\chi}_{abc}$

$$\delta\hat{\psi}_\alpha^a = \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \hat{\epsilon}^a - \frac{1}{6}g\Omega^{ab}W_{bc}\hat{\gamma}_\alpha \hat{\epsilon}^c = 0, \quad (140)$$

$$\delta\hat{\chi}^{abc} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}gA_{abcd}\hat{\epsilon}^d = 0. \quad (141)$$

It was verified that these two Killing equations are equivalent and trivially satisfied in above AdS_5 vacuum configuration. This can be shown as the following. First, Eq. (140) leads to the integrability condition,

$$\left[\left(\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma} \hat{\gamma}^{\delta\sigma} \right) \delta_b^a - \frac{2}{9}g^2 W^{ac} W_{bc} \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta} \right] \hat{\epsilon}^b = 0. \quad (142)$$

This equation and the Riemannian curvature tensor of AdS_5 space-time

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma} &= \frac{1}{4}\Lambda (\hat{g}_{\alpha\delta}\hat{g}_{\beta\sigma} - \hat{g}_{\alpha\sigma}\hat{g}_{\beta\delta}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{3}P_0 (\hat{g}_{\alpha\delta}\hat{g}_{\beta\sigma} - \hat{g}_{\alpha\sigma}\hat{g}_{\beta\delta}) \end{aligned} \quad (143)$$

imply that ϵ^a should be an eigenvector of the real symmetric matrix W_{ab} ,

$$(W^2)^a_b \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta} \hat{\epsilon}^b = -\frac{3}{g^2}P_0 \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta} \hat{\epsilon}^a. \quad (144)$$

The cosmological constant Λ and the critical point W_{ab} given in Eqs. (138) and (139) commit Eq. (142) to stand identically. Further, the contraction of ϵ^a with the last identity in Eq. (119) yields

$$\hat{\epsilon}^a A_{acde} A_b{}^{cde} = 4\hat{\epsilon}^a \left[(W^2)_{ab} - \frac{3}{g^2}P_0 \Omega_{ab} \right]. \quad (145)$$

Eqs. (144) and (145) determine that those two Killing equations (140) and (141) are equivalent. Since there is no constraint on the Killing spinor $\hat{\epsilon}^a$, the AdS_5 vacuum configuration thus preserves the full $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supersymmetry.

We see from above discussion that in the gauging process the global $E_{6(6)}$ symmetry first breaks to its maximal subgroup $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ and then $SL(6, R)$ breaks to its subgroup $SO(6)$. The $SL(2, R)$ remains as a global symmetry in the five-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 8$ gauged supergravity, which can be considered as the $SL(2, R)$ symmetry of type IIB supergravity if the gauged supergravity is obtained from the compactification of type IIB supergravity on S^5 . Originally in the ungauged case there are 42 scalar fields, two of which should be interpreted as the dilaton and axion. The quantities W_{ab} and W_{abcd} consisting of the scalar potential are the complicated $SL(6, R) \times SL(2, R)$ invariant combination of scalar fields. It turned out that W_{ab} and W_{abcd} depends only on 20 scalar fields M_{IJ} , which

is obtained from the combination of those 40 scalar fields. (M_{IJ}) is symmetric matrix and parametrizes the coset space $SL(6, R)/SO(6)$. Further, the $SO(6)$ symmetry can take M to be the diagonal form (137). This shows that finally there are only 5 scalar fields in the theory. Further, using an orthonormal parametrization [69], $\lambda_I = \alpha_{Ii} \hat{\phi}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 5$, one can replace α_I of Eq. (137) by five independent fields $\hat{\phi}_i$. The explicit form of (α_{Ii}) is given in Ref. [69]. The classical Lagrangian consisting of only gravitational and scalar fields is

$$\hat{e}^{-1} \mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4} \hat{R} + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha \hat{\phi}_i \partial^\alpha \hat{\phi}^i - P[\hat{\phi}], \quad (146)$$

and the scalar potential can be written as

$$P[\hat{\phi}] = \frac{g^2}{8} \sum_{i=1}^5 \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial \hat{\phi}_i} \right)^2 - \frac{g^2}{3} W^2, \quad (147)$$

Near the critical point, $\hat{\phi}_i = 0$, one has the approximation expansions

$$\begin{aligned} W[\hat{\phi}] &= - \left[\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^5 (\hat{\phi}_i)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}) \right] \\ P[\hat{\phi}] &= -\frac{3}{4} g^2 - \frac{3}{32} g^2 \sum_{i=1}^5 (\hat{\phi}_i)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}). \end{aligned} \quad (148)$$

mmmmmmmm

We can in principle do the same thing on $\mathcal{N} = 8$ $SO(6)$ gauged supergravity: expanding the theory around the AdS_5 vacuum and observing the solution to linearized equation of motion whether they constitute an off-shell multiplet for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal supergravity in four-dimensions. However, in practice, this procedure is much more complicated to implement than the $\mathcal{N} = 2, 4$ cases. Despite of the complication of this procedure, there are quite a number of evidences supporting this identification between on-shell five-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 8$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity and off-shell $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions. The $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supersymmetry group in AdS_5 space is $SU(2, 2|4)$ and it is exactly the $N = 4$ superconformal group in four dimensions. In particular, the on-shell degrees of freedom of the gauged $\mathcal{N} = 8$ $SO(6)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity counted with $SO(3)$ little group matches identically with the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ off-shell conformal supergravity in four dimensions.

The field content of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions consists 1 graviton e_μ^r , 4 gravitini ψ_μ^i , 15 $SU(4)$ (or $SO(6)$) gauge fields $V_{\mu j}^i$, 1 complex field φ , 4 spinors χ^i , 10 complex scalars $E_{(ij)}$, 20 spinor fields $\lambda_{[ij]}^k$, 6 antisymmetric tensors $B_{\mu\nu}^{[ij]}$. The transformations under supersymmetry and special supersymmetry generators for the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal supergravity multiplets should be reproduced from Eq. (120) near the AdS_5 vacuum configuration [60, 21, 87],

$$\begin{aligned} \delta e_\mu^r &= \frac{1}{2} \bar{\epsilon}^i \gamma^r \psi_{\mu i} + \text{h.c.}, \\ \delta \psi_\mu^i &= D_\mu \epsilon^i - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{\nu\lambda} B_{\nu\lambda}^{-ij} \gamma_\mu \epsilon_j - \gamma_\mu \eta^i, \\ \delta V_{\mu j}^i &= \left(-\bar{\xi}_\mu^i \epsilon_j + \frac{1}{4} \delta_j^i \bar{\xi}_\mu^k \epsilon_k + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\epsilon}^k \gamma_\mu \chi_{kj}^i - \bar{\psi}^i \eta_j + \frac{1}{4} \delta_j^i \bar{\psi}_\mu^k \epsilon_k \right) + \text{h.c.}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\phi &= \frac{1}{2}\bar{\epsilon}^i\chi_i, \\
\delta\chi_i &= \gamma^\mu D_\mu\phi\epsilon_i + \frac{1}{2}E_{ij}\chi^j + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijkl}\gamma^{\mu\nu}B_{\mu\nu}^{-kl}\epsilon^j, \\
\delta E_{ij} &= \frac{1}{2}(\bar{\epsilon}_i\gamma^\mu D_\mu\chi_j + \bar{\epsilon}_j\gamma^\mu D_\mu\chi_i) - \frac{1}{2}\bar{\epsilon}^k(\bar{\lambda}_{i\epsilon}^{lm}{}_{jklm} + \bar{\lambda}_{j\epsilon}^{lm}{}_{iklm}) \\
&\quad - (\bar{\eta}_i\chi_j + \bar{\eta}_j\chi_i), \\
\delta D_{kl}^{ij} &= -2(\bar{\epsilon}^i\gamma^\mu D_\mu\lambda_{kl}^j - \bar{\epsilon}^j\gamma^\mu D_\mu\lambda_{kl}^i) + \delta_k^i\bar{\epsilon}^m\gamma^\mu D_\mu\lambda_{ml}^j \\
&\quad - \delta_l^i\bar{\epsilon}^m\gamma^\mu D_\mu\lambda_{mk}^j - \delta_k^j\bar{\epsilon}^m\gamma^\mu D_\mu\lambda_{ml}^i + \delta_l^j\bar{\epsilon}^m\gamma^\mu D_\mu\lambda_{mk}^i, \\
\delta B_{\mu\nu}^{-ij} &= \frac{1}{2}(\bar{\epsilon}^i R_{\mu\nu}^j[Q] - \bar{\epsilon}^j R_{\mu\nu}^i[Q]) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\epsilon}^k\gamma_{\mu\nu}\lambda_{\epsilon k}^{ij} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{ijkl}\bar{\epsilon}_k\gamma^\rho D_\rho\gamma_{\mu\nu}\tilde{\chi}_l - \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{ijkl}\bar{\epsilon}_k\gamma_{\mu\nu}\chi_l, \\
\delta\lambda_{\epsilon k}^{ij} &= -\frac{1}{2}\gamma^{\mu\nu}\gamma^\rho D_\rho\left[B_{\mu\nu}^{-ij}\epsilon_k + \frac{1}{3}(\delta_k^i B_{\mu\nu}^{-jl} - \delta_k^j B_{\mu\nu}^{-il})\epsilon_l\right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\left[(R_{\mu\nu k}^i[V]\epsilon^j - R_{\mu\nu k}^j[V]\epsilon^i) + \frac{1}{3}(\delta_k^i R_{\mu\nu l}^j[V] - \delta_k^j R_{\mu\nu l}^i[V])\epsilon^l\right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{ijlm}\gamma^\mu D_\mu E_{kl}\epsilon_m + \frac{1}{2}D_{kl}^{ij}\epsilon^l - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijlm}E_{kl}\eta_m \\
&\quad + \gamma^{\mu\nu}\left[B_{\mu\nu}^{-ij}\eta_k + \frac{1}{3}(\delta_k^i B_{\mu\nu}^{-jl} - \delta_k^j B_{\mu\nu}^{-il})\eta_l\right], \tag{149}
\end{aligned}$$

where ξ_μ^i and $R_{\mu\nu}^i[Q]$ are listed in (103); The curvature $R_{\mu\nu j}^i[V]$ relevant to local $SU_R(4)$ symmetry are the corresponding gauge field strength but with fermionic terms required by supersymmetry,

$$R_{\mu\nu j}^i[V] = \partial_\mu V_{\nu j}^i - \partial_\nu V_{\mu j}^i + [V_\mu, V_\nu]^i{}_j - 2\left[\left(\bar{\psi}_{[\mu}\xi_{\nu]j}^i - \frac{1}{4}\delta_{\epsilon j}^i\bar{\psi}_{[\mu}^k\xi_{\nu]k}\right) + \text{h.c.}\right]. \tag{150}$$

IV. EXTERNAL SUPERCONFORMAL ANOMALY FROM ADS/CFT CORRESPONDENCE

A. Generality

In this section we show how the external superconformal anomaly (10) can be obtained from the gauged supergravity in the AdS_5 vacuum configuration. First, the relation Eq. (48), which is established based on AdS_5/CFT_4 correspondence, tells that the quantum effective action of the supersymmetric $SU(N)$ gauge theory at large- N limit in a conformal supergravity background is equal to the on-shell action of five-dimensional gauged supergravity evaluated with the classical solutions which asymptotically approach to the AdS_5 vacuum configuration. In last section it was verified explicitly (in $\mathcal{N} = 2, 4$ cases) that the AdS_5 boundary data actually constitute certain off-shell conformal supergravity multiplet in four dimensions. Correspondingly, on the AdS_5 boundary, the bulk diffeomorphism symmetry decomposes the four-dimensional diffeomorphism symmetry and the Weyl symmetry; the

bulk supersymmetry converts into the Poincaré supersymmetry and the super-Weyl symmetry in four dimensions, and the bulk gauge symmetry separates into four-dimensional vector- and axial vector gauge symmetries. Eq. (48) means that the external conformal supergravity background in the context of *AdS/CFT* correspondence is furnished by the AdS_5 boundary data of on-shell gauged supergravity in five dimensions. On the other hand, Eqs. (7), (8) and (9) imply that the (covariant) conservation of superconformal current multiplet of a supersymmetric gauge theory is completely equivalent to the local conformal supersymmetry of external conformal supergravity background. Thus the violation of local conformal supersymmetry in the background effective action $\Gamma_{\text{CFT}}[\phi_0]$ means the arising of superconformal anomaly. Therefore, we calculate the above on-shell action of five-dimensional gauged supergravity and check its supersymmetry variations near AdS_5 boundary. Due to the large volume of AdS_5 boundary, the on-shell action of gauged supergravity near AdS_5 boundary usually suffers from IR divergence. One should employ a so-called holographic renormalization procedure to make it well defined. This process cannot preserve above bulk symmetry reduction in each pair simultaneously. The physical consideration requires that the four-dimensional diffeomorphism symmetry, the Poincaré supersymmetry and the vector gauge symmetry should be preserved, hence the external superconformal conformal anomaly arises. It is usually called the holographic superconformal anomaly since it is reproduced from the five-dimensional bulk theory.

In the following we review how the holographic superconformal anomaly can be produced from the on-shell five-dimensional gauged supergravity.

B. Holographic Chiral R -symmetry Anomaly

The reproduction of the holographic chiral R -symmetry anomaly lies in the Chern-Simons five-form term in five-dimensional gauged supergravity. As is well known, the Chern-Simons term has a remarkable feature; its variation under gauge transformation is a total derivative. According to differential geometry construction on chiral anomaly [71], this total derivative term is just the (consistent) chiral anomaly since it satisfies the Wess-Zumino condition [72]. Therefore, based on Eq. (48), we perform gauge transformation on classical action of gauged supergravity. All other terms are gauge invariant except that the Chern-Simons five-form yields a total derivative term under gauge transformation. We then take this total derivative to the AdS_5 boundary and use the boundary reductions of bulk gauge field and gauge symmetry to extract out the chiral anomaly. The fact that the holographic chiral R -symmetry anomaly of supersymmetric gauge theory can be obtained from the Chern-Simons term in five-dimensional gauged supergravity side was first pointed by Witten [4] and later it was explored beyond the leading order of large- N expansion [93,94].

1. Holographic $SU(4)$ Bardeen Anomaly from $\mathcal{N} = 8$ Gauged AdS_5 Supergravity

In $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory, the chiral R -symmetry is $SU_R(4)$, which corresponds to $SO(6) \cong SU(4)$ gauge symmetry in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ five-dimensional supergravity. It should be emphasized that the $SU_R(4)$ symmetry in supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory is a global symmetry. An external vector A_μ^a must couple with the chiral $SU_R(4)$ current j_μ^a

to yield the anomaly, here $a = 1, \dots, 15$ denoting $SU(4)$ group indices (or $a = [IJ]$ $SO(6)$ indices). The AdS_5 boundary value $A_\mu^a(x)$ of the bulk $SU(4)$ gauge field $\hat{A}_\alpha^a(x, r)$ provides such an external field in terms of the holographic version on AdS/CFT correspondence. According to Eq. (47) we have

$$S_{\text{SUGRA}}[\hat{A}_\alpha^a[A_\mu^a(x)], \dots] = \Gamma_{\text{SYM}}[A_\mu^a, \dots] \quad (151)$$

Recall that there exists the Chern-Simons term in five-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 8$ gauged supergravity,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{CS}}[\hat{A}] &= \frac{l^3}{48\pi G^{(5)}} \int \text{Tr} \left(\hat{A} \hat{F}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \hat{A}^3 \hat{F} + \frac{1}{10} \hat{A}^5 \right) \\ &= \frac{l^3}{48\pi G^{(5)}} \int \text{Tr} \left(\hat{A} (d\hat{A})^2 + \frac{3}{2} \hat{A}^3 d\hat{A} + \frac{3}{5} \hat{A}^5 \right) \\ &= \frac{l^3}{192\pi G^{(5)}} \int d^5x \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma} d^{abc} \left(\hat{A}_\alpha^a \hat{F}_{\beta\gamma}^b \hat{F}_{\delta\sigma}^c - f^{ade} \hat{A}_\alpha^d \hat{A}_\beta^e \hat{A}_\gamma^b \hat{F}_{\delta\sigma}^c \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2}{5} f^{ade} f^{efg} \hat{A}_\alpha^d \hat{A}_\beta^f \hat{A}_\gamma^g \hat{A}_\delta^b \hat{A}_\sigma^c \right), \end{aligned} \quad (152)$$

where $d^{abc} = \text{Tr} (t^a t^b t^c)$, $[t^a, t^b] = i f^{abc} t^c$. Making the following $SU(4)$ gauge transformation on five-dimensional gauged supergravity near AdS_5 vacuum configuration,

$$\delta \hat{A}_\alpha^a(x, r) = (\widehat{D}_\alpha V(x, r))^a, \quad (153)$$

with $V(x, r) = V^a(x, r) t^a$ being the gauge transformation parameter, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_V S_{\text{SUGRA}}[\hat{A}[A], \dots] &= \delta_V S_{\text{CS}}[\hat{A}] = \int d\omega_4^1(V, \hat{A}) = \int \omega_4^1(v, A) \\ &= \frac{l^3}{48\pi G^{(5)}} \int \text{Tr} \left[v d \left(AdA + \frac{1}{2} A^3 \right) \right] \\ &= \delta_v \Gamma[A_\mu^a, \dots] = \int d^4x \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta A_\mu^a(x)} \delta A_\mu^a(x) \\ &= \int d^4x \langle j^{a\mu} \rangle \delta A_\mu^a(x) = \int d^4x j^{a\mu}(x) [D_\mu v(x)]^a \\ &= - \int d^4x v^a(x) [D_\mu j^\mu(x)]^a, \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

where we have used Eq. (151) and the AdS_5 boundary reduction of bulk gauge fields as well as the Stora-Zumino chain of descent equations,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{i^{n+2}}{(2\pi)^n (n+1)!} \text{Tr} F^{n+1} &= d\omega_{2n+1}[A], \\ \delta_v \omega_{2n+1} &= d\omega_{2n}^1(v, A). \end{aligned} \quad (155)$$

If we consider the string origin of the AdS/CFT correspondence and the fact that the $\mathcal{N} = 8$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity can be obtained from the type IIB supergravity around $AdS_5 \times S^5$ background, there should exist following relations among the AdS_5 radius l , string

coupling g_s , the flux N passing through S^5 , and also a connection between the five- and ten-dimensional gravitational constants due to the compactification of the type IIB supergravity on S^5 of radius l [31],

$$G^{(5)} = \frac{G^{(10)}}{\text{Volume}(S^5)} = \frac{G^{(10)}}{l^5 \pi^3}, \quad G^{(10)} = 8\pi^6 g_s^2, \quad l = (4\pi N g_s)^{1/4}. \quad (156)$$

Hence we immediately recognize from Eq. (154) the Bardeen anomaly up to the normalization constant [95,96].

$$[D_\mu j^\mu(x)]^a = -\frac{N^2}{24\pi^2} e^{-1} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \partial_\mu \text{Tr} t^a \left(A_\nu \partial_\lambda A_\rho + \frac{1}{2} A_\nu A_\lambda A_\rho \right). \quad (157)$$

2. Holographic Chiral $U_R(1)$ Anomaly from $SU(2) \times U(1)$ Gauged $\mathcal{N} = 4$ AdS_5 Supergravity

In four-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory, the R -symmetry is the $U_R(2) \cong SU(2) \times U(1)$. It is the $U_R(1)$ that becomes anomalous. Observing the classical action (87) of $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauged $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supergravity, we see that there exists a $SU(2) \times U(1)$ -mixed Chern-Simons term,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{CS}}[\widehat{W}, \widehat{A}] &= -\frac{l^3}{8 \times 16\pi G^{(5)}} \int d^5x \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma} \widehat{W}_{\alpha\beta}^a \widehat{W}_{\gamma\delta}^a \widehat{A}_\sigma \\ &= -\frac{l^3}{16\pi G^{(5)}} \int \text{Tr} \left(\widehat{W} \wedge \widehat{W} \right) \wedge \widehat{A}. \end{aligned} \quad (158)$$

Under the bulk $U(1)$ gauge transformation $\delta_V \widehat{A} = dV$ on $\mathcal{N} = 4$ gauged supergravity near AdS_5 vacuum configuration, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_V S_{\text{SUGRA}}[\widehat{W}[W], \widehat{A}[A], \dots] &= \delta_V S_{\text{CS}}[\widehat{W}[W], \widehat{A}[A]] \\ &= -\frac{l^3}{16\pi G^{(5)}} \int \text{Tr} \left(\widehat{W} \wedge \widehat{W} \right) \wedge dV = -\frac{l^3}{16\pi G^{(5)}} \int d \left[V \text{Tr} \left(\widehat{W} \wedge \widehat{W} \right) \right] \\ &= -\frac{l^3}{16\pi G^{(5)}} \int v \text{Tr} (W \wedge W). \end{aligned} \quad (159)$$

According to the AdS/CFT correspondence (47) at gauged supergravity level, Eq. (159) should equal to

$$\delta_v \Gamma_{\text{SYM}}[W, A] = - \int d^4x v D_\mu j^\mu. \quad (160)$$

Thus we obtain the chiral $U_R(1)$ anomaly of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory at the leading-order of large- N expansion,

$$D_\mu j^\mu = \frac{N^2}{32\pi^2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} W_{\mu\nu}^a W_{\lambda\rho}^a. \quad (161)$$

Finally, we briefly mention that the holographic chiral $U_R(1)$ anomaly of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theory can be easily obtained from the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$

gauged supergravity near AdS_5 vacuum configuration. According to Eq.(55), the $U(1)$ Chern-Simons term reads

$$S_{CS}[\hat{A}] = \frac{l^3}{16\pi G^{(5)}} \int d\hat{A} \wedge d\hat{A} \wedge \hat{A} = \frac{l^3}{64\pi G^{(5)}} \int d^5x \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma\delta} \hat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \hat{F}_{\gamma\sigma} \hat{A}_\delta. \quad (162)$$

The AdS/CFT correspondence and the variation of Chern-Simons term under bulk $U(1)$ gauge transformation yields the $U(1)$ chiral anomaly of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric gauge theory in the external conformal supergravity background.

C. Holographic Weyl Anomaly

It is non-trivial to recognize the trace anomaly of a supersymmetric gauge theory from the supergravity side. The origin of trace anomaly lies in the near- AdS_5 boundary behavior of the classical solution of the gauged supergravity. In the earlier works on gauged supergravity [66,84,85] the dynamical behavior of five-dimensional gauged supergravity near AdS_5 vacuum configuration was neglected. It was first found in Ref. [5] that due to the infinity of the AdS_5 boundary, the on-shell action of gauged supergravity near AdS_5 vacuum configuration is not well defined and the infrared divergence arises. This IR divergence is dual to the UV divergence of the supersymmetric gauge theory defined on AdS_5 boundary. One must perform a “ holomorphic renormalization ” procedure [98,99] to manipulate this divergence. It is very similar to the renormalization method of dealing with the UV divergence in a perturbative quantum field theory. That is, one must first introduce a cut-off (IR regulator) to make the space-time have a finite volume and calculate the on-shell bulk gravitational action, then introduces the counterterms according to the renormalization condition to make the on-shell action of gauged supergravity near the AdS_5 boundary well defined. Finally one removes the cut-off and hence obtains a finite on-shell bulk action. However, there exists an ambiguity when adding the finite counterterms. One usually chooses the diffeomorphism symmetry on the boundary to fix this ambiguity. As stated above, the diffeomorphism symmetry of the gauged supergravity near the AdS_5 boundary decomposes into the diffeomorphism symmetry [25] and the Weyl symmetry. These two symmetries cannot be preserved simultaneously during the holomorphic renormalization process. When requiring the diffeomorphism symmetry to be preserved, one thus obtains the Weyl anomaly of a supersymmetric gauge theory in the curved space-time. In the following we show how the holographic Weyl anomaly comes from the gauged supergravity.

We must look for the domain wall solution of the gauged $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity which asymptotically approaches to the AdS_5 geometry. Without losing generality, in $\mathcal{N} = 4, 8$ cases, we consider the gauged supergravity consisting of only gravitational- and scalar fields. The classical action is listed in Eq.(146) and the cosmological constant originates from the critical value of the scalar potential. It should be emphasized that the presence of scalar fields is necessary for the existence of domain wall solution, otherwise there will be no non-trivial vacuum configurations and the domain wall solutions cannot arise. We consider only the scalar field for simplification. The corresponding classical field equations are the Einstein equation (121) and the scalar field equation

$$\nabla_\mu \partial^\mu \phi = \frac{\partial P}{\partial \phi}. \quad (163)$$

For $\mathcal{N} = 2$ case, we consider the pure gravitational field with the cosmological constant term and assume that the constant term comes from the critical value of certain scalar potential.

We use the results in Ref. [98], The domain wall solution preserving the 4-dimensional general covariance takes the form given in Eq. (53). Further, near the boundary $r \rightarrow 0$, there must exist $\hat{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, r) \rightarrow g_{\mu\nu}(x)$, $\hat{\phi}(x, r) \rightarrow 0$ ⁴. Based on these requirements, the gravitational fields near the boundary should have the following expansion in the radial coordinate,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, r) &= g_{(0)\mu\nu}(x) + g_{(2)\mu\nu}(x) \frac{r^2}{l^2} \\ &+ \left(\frac{r^2}{l^2} \right)^2 \left[g_{(4)\mu\nu} + h_{1(4)\mu\nu} \ln \frac{r^2}{l^2} + h_{2(4)\mu\nu} \left(\ln \frac{r^2}{l^2} \right)^2 \right] + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (164)$$

Substituting this expansion into the Einstein equation (121) with the cosmological constant furnished by the value of the scalar potential at the critical point $\hat{\phi} = 0$, one can determine the coefficients $g_{(2k)\mu\nu}$'s and $h_{\mu\nu}$'s in terms of the leading coefficient $g_{(0)\mu\nu}(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_{(2)\mu\nu} &= \frac{l^2}{2} \left(R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{6} R g_{(0)\mu\nu} \right), \\ h_{1(4)\mu\nu} &= \frac{l^4}{8} \left(R_{\mu\lambda\nu\rho} R^{\lambda\rho} + \frac{1}{6} \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu R - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3} R R_{\mu\nu} \right) \\ &+ \frac{l^4}{32} g_{(0)\mu\nu} \left(\frac{1}{3} \nabla^2 R + \frac{1}{3} R^2 - R_{\lambda\rho} R^{\lambda\rho} \right), \\ h_{2(4)\mu\nu} &= 0, \\ g_{(4)\mu\nu} &= \frac{1}{4} \left(g_{(2)} \right)_{\mu\nu}^2, \\ \nabla^\nu g_{(4)\mu\nu} &= \nabla^\nu \left\{ -\frac{1}{8} \left[\text{Tr} g_{(2)}^2 - \left(\text{Tr} g_{(2)} \right)^2 \right] g_{(0)\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \left(g_{(2)}^2 \right)_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} g_{(2)\mu\nu} \text{Tr} g_{(2)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (165)$$

In above equation, $R_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}$, $R_{\mu\nu}$ and R are the Riemannian curvature, Ricci tensor and scalar curvature defined with respect to $g_{(0)\mu\nu}$.

However, when one substitutes above solution into the classical action of the bulk gauged supergravity, the on-shell action is divergent near the AdS_5 boundary. So one has to introduce a cut-off ϵ to perform IR regularization, that is, taking the integral in radial coordinate to a finite domain by choosing $r = \epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{reg}} &= \frac{1}{8\pi G^{(5)}} \int_{r=\epsilon>0} \int d^5 X \sqrt{-\hat{g}} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \hat{R} - P[\hat{\phi}_0 = 0] \right) \\ &= \frac{l^5}{8\pi G^{(5)}} \int_\epsilon \frac{dr}{r^5} \int d^4 x \sqrt{\hat{g}(x, r)} \frac{2}{3} P[\hat{\phi} = 0] \\ &= -\frac{l^5}{8\pi G^{(5)}} \int_\epsilon \frac{dr}{r^5} \int d^4 x \sqrt{\hat{g}(x, r)} \frac{4}{3} \Lambda = \frac{l^3}{\pi G^{(5)}} \int_\epsilon \frac{dr}{r^5} \int d^4 x \sqrt{\hat{g}(x, r)} \end{aligned}$$

⁴Precisely speaking, the bulk scalar field should satisfy the Dirichlet boundary condition, $\phi(x, r) \rightarrow r^{(4-\Delta)/2}$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, Δ being the scale dimension of the composite operator in supersymmetric gauge theory coupled with $\phi(x)$, the boundary value of $\hat{\phi}(x, r)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{l^3}{\pi G^{(5)}} \int d^4x \sqrt{g_0(x)} \int_\epsilon \frac{dr}{r^5} \left\{ 1 + \frac{r^2}{2l^2} \text{Tr} g_{(2)} + \frac{r^4}{4l^4} \left[(\text{Tr} g_{(2)})^2 - \text{Tr} g_{(2)}^2 \right] + \dots \right\} \\
&= \frac{l^3}{\pi G^{(5)}} \int d^4x \sqrt{g_{(0)}} \left[-\frac{1}{4\epsilon^4} - \frac{1}{12\epsilon^2} R - \frac{1}{16} \ln \frac{\epsilon}{l} \left(R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3} R^2 \right) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{finite}} \right] \\
&= S_{\epsilon^{-4}} + S_{\epsilon^{-2}} + S_{\ln \epsilon} + S_{\text{finite}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{166}$$

In deriving above result, we have used the Einstein equation (121) at the critical point of the scalar potential $\hat{\phi}_0 = 0$, the identification $\Lambda = -2P[\phi = 0] = -6/l^2$ and the matrix operation

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{\det(1+A)} &= \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \ln(1+A) \right] = \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(A - \frac{1}{2} A^2 + \dots \right) \right] \\
&= 1 + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} A + \frac{1}{4} \left[(\text{Tr} A)^2 - \text{Tr} A^2 \right] + \dots,
\end{aligned} \tag{167}$$

$\mathcal{L}_{\text{finite}}$ consists of the terms that survive $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit.

To make the on-shell action well defined, one must first define a subtracted action by introducing the counterterms to cancel the IR divergence in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$S_{\text{sub}}[g_{(0)\mu\nu}, \epsilon, \dots] = S_{\text{reg}} + S_{\text{counter}} \tag{168}$$

A holographically renormalized on-shell action for the five-dimensional gauged supergravity is obtained after the IR regulator is removed,

$$S_{\text{ren}}[g_{(0)\mu\nu}, \dots] = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} S_{\text{sub}}[g_{(0)\mu\nu}, \epsilon, \dots] \tag{169}$$

In adding counterterms there appears a finite ambiguity similar to that when canceling the UV divergence in a perturbative quantum field theory. This ambiguity can be fixed by the symmetry requirement. As is explicitly shown in Ref. [25], the bulk diffeomorphism symmetry

$$\delta \hat{g}_{\alpha\beta} = \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \hat{\xi}_\beta + \widehat{\nabla}_\beta \hat{\xi}_\alpha \tag{170}$$

preserving the form of domain wall solution (53) should take the following form,

$$\delta \hat{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, r) = 2\sigma(x) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} r \partial_r \right) \hat{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, r) + \left[\widehat{\nabla}_\mu \hat{\xi}_\nu(x, r) + \widehat{\nabla}_\nu \hat{\xi}_\mu(x, r) \right], \tag{171}$$

where $\sigma(x) = l^2 \xi_5(x)/(2r^2)$ and the covariant derivative $\widehat{\nabla}_\mu$ is defined with respect to $\hat{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, r)$. Eq. (171) means that the bulk diffeomorphism transformation decomposes into a Weyl transformation and a diffeomorphism transformation on $\hat{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, r)$. Near the AdS_5 boundary $r \rightarrow 0$, from Eq. (164) and the series expansion for the Killing spinor,

$$\hat{\xi}^\mu(x, r) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \xi_{(n)}^\mu(x) \left(\frac{r^2}{l^2} \right)^n, \tag{172}$$

we can see that the 5-dimensional bulk diffeomorphism symmetry reduces to the Weyl- and the diffeomorphism symmetries on AdS_5 boundary,

$$\delta g_{(0)\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu \xi_\nu(x) + \nabla_\nu \xi_\mu, \quad (173)$$

$$\delta g_{(0)\mu\nu} = 2\sigma(x)g_{(0)\mu\nu}. \quad (174)$$

Requiring the four-dimensional diffeomorphism symmetry (173) preserved in the subtraction process, one can only introduce the following counterterm in the sense of “minimal subtraction”⁵,

$$S_{\text{count}} = \frac{l^3}{\pi G^{(5)}} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_{(0)}} \left[\frac{1}{4\epsilon^4} + \frac{1}{12\epsilon^2} R + \frac{1}{16} \left(R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3} R^2 \right) \ln \frac{\epsilon}{l} \right]. \quad (175)$$

Consequently, we have

$$S_{\text{ren}} = \frac{l^3}{\pi G^{(5)}} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_{(0)}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{finite}} = \Gamma_{\text{SYM}}[g_{(0)\mu\nu} \langle T^{\mu\nu} \rangle, \dots]. \quad (176)$$

One can directly calculate the variation of the renormalized on-shell action under the Weyl transformation (174) to extract out the Weyl anomaly. However, the most convenient way is choosing the Weyl transformation parameter $\sigma(x)$ as a constant σ and using the scale symmetry of the regularized action (166). In this way, the Weyl anomaly in the renormalized on-shell action can be equivalently obtained from the scale transformation of the counterterms. The IR regularized action (166) is invariant under the combination of scale transformations, $\delta g_{(0)\mu\nu} = 2\sigma g_{(0)\mu\nu}$, $\delta\epsilon = 2\sigma\epsilon$ [5],

$$(\delta_{g_0} + \delta_\epsilon) S_{\text{reg}} = (\delta_{g_0} + \delta_\epsilon) (S_{\epsilon^{-4}} + S_{\epsilon^{-2}} + S_{\ln \epsilon} + S_{\text{finite}}) = 0. \quad (177)$$

It can be directly checked that [5]

$$\delta_{g_0} (S_{\epsilon^{-4}} + S_{\epsilon^{-2}}) = 0, \quad \delta_\epsilon (S_{\epsilon^{-4}} + S_{\epsilon^{-2}}) = 0, \quad \delta_{g_0} S_{\ln \epsilon} = 0, \quad \delta_\epsilon S_{\text{finite}} = 0. \quad (178)$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{g_0} S_{\text{finite}} &= \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_{(0)}} \langle T^\mu_\mu \rangle \sigma = -\delta_\epsilon S_{\ln \epsilon} \\ &= \frac{l^3}{8\pi G^{(5)}} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_{(0)}} \left(R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3} R^2 \right) \sigma, \end{aligned} \quad (179)$$

and yields the Weyl anomaly [5,98],

$$\langle T^\mu_\mu \rangle = \frac{N^2}{4\pi^2} \left(R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3} R^2 \right). \quad (180)$$

$$\delta_\sigma S_{\text{ren}} = - \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_{(0)}} \langle T^\mu_\mu \rangle \sigma. \quad (181)$$

gives the Weyl anomaly in the gravitational background,

⁵The geometric meaning of the counterterm becomes much clearer if it is expressed in terms of the induced metric on the boundary $g_{\mu\nu}(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \hat{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, \epsilon)/\epsilon$ [97].

$$\mathcal{A} = \langle T^\mu_\mu \rangle = \frac{N^2}{4\pi^2} \left(R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3} R^2 \right). \quad (182)$$

It can be further rewritten as the combination of the A - and B -type anomalies up to the coefficients, i.e, the sum of the Euler number and the square of Weyl tensor [5,90],

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T^\mu_\mu \rangle &= -\frac{N^2}{\pi^2} (E_4 + W_4), \\ E_4 &= \frac{1}{8} \tilde{R}_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \tilde{R}^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} = \frac{1}{8} \left(R^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} R_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} - 4 R^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu} + R^2 \right), \\ W_4 &= -\frac{1}{8} C_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} C^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} = -\frac{1}{8} \left(R^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} R_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} - 2 R^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{3} R^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (183)$$

It is exactly the trace anomaly of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in the external gravitational field at the leading order of the large- N expansion [5].

There are also contribution to Weyl anomaly from scalar- and gauge fields, which can be obtained in the same way as the gravitational field.

The holographic Weyl anomalies for $\mathcal{N} = 1, 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory take the same forms as that in Eqs.(182) and (183), only the anomaly coefficients are different due to different particle contents in the corresponding supersymmetric gauge theories.

D. Holographic Super-Weyl Anomaly of Supersymmetry Current

The arising of holographic super-Weyl anomaly is due to the universal feature of a supersymmetric field theory. The supersymmetric variation of the Lagrangian of the gauged supergravity should be composed of the total derivative terms. This terms cannot be naively ignored due to the non-emptiness of AdS_5 boundary. As shown in Sect. III, the bulk supersymmetry transformations for the on-shell fields near the AdS_5 boundary convert into the four-dimensional supersymmetric transformation and the super-Weyl transformation. When we take those total derivative terms yielded from the supersymmetric variation of on-shell action of gauged supergravity to the AdS_5 boundary, the surface terms may be IR divergent since the on-shell action has IR divergence due to the large AdS_5 boundary. Like in calculating the holographic Weyl anomaly, the holographic renormalization procedure is needed to make the surface term behave well. This will make either the four-dimensional Poincaré supersymmetry or the super-Weyl symmetry on AdS_5 boundary violated. Usually the Poincaré supersymmetry should be preserved, the surface term thus gives the super-Weyl anomaly (the γ -trace anomaly). In the following we take $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged supergravity (55) as illustrating example and show how the holographic super-Weyl anomaly of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric gauge theory arises.

The concrete calculation on supersymmetry variation of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged supergravity (55) was given in Ref. [26]. Here we list the main results.

First, the supersymmetric variation of the Einstein-Hilbert action and cosmological term gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_{\text{GR}} &= \delta \int d^5 x \hat{e} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \hat{R} - \frac{6}{l^2} \right) \\ &= \int d^5 x \hat{e} \left[-\frac{1}{2} \hat{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}_m \hat{\psi}_a^\alpha \left(\hat{R}_\alpha^m - \frac{1}{2} \hat{e}_\alpha^m \hat{R} - \frac{6}{l^2} \hat{e}_\alpha^m \right) - \hat{\nabla}_\alpha \left(\hat{e}_m^\alpha \hat{e}_n^\beta \delta \hat{\omega}_\beta^{mn} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (184)$$

In above equation the inertial coordinate system is usually chosen so that the surface term is quadratic in fermionic fields and the supersymmetry transformation parameter.

The variation of the pure gauge field terms (including Chern-Simons term) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta S_{\text{GAU}} &= \int d^5x \delta \left[\hat{e} \left(-\frac{3l^2}{32} \right) \hat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{l^3}{64} i \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma} \hat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \hat{F}_{\gamma\delta} \hat{A}_\sigma \right] \\
&= \int d^5x \left\{ \hat{e} \left[-\frac{3l^2}{64} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^\alpha \hat{\psi}_{\alpha a} \hat{F}_{\beta\delta} \hat{F}^{\beta\delta} + \frac{3il}{8} \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \left(\hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \right) - \frac{3il}{8} \left(\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \right) \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{3l^2}{32} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma} \left[\frac{2}{3} \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \left(\hat{A}_\sigma \hat{F}_{\gamma\delta} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \hat{F}_{\gamma\delta} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\psi}_{\sigma a} \right] \right\}. \tag{185}
\end{aligned}$$

The supersymmetric variations of the terms concerning gravitino is quite lengthy. We first calculate the variation of the kinetic terms for gravitino,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta S_{\text{KF}} &= \delta \int d^5x \left[-\frac{1}{2} \bar{\hat{e}} \hat{\psi}_\alpha \hat{e}_m^\alpha \hat{e}_n^\beta \hat{e}_p^\delta \hat{\gamma}^{mnp} \left(\widehat{\nabla}_\beta \hat{\psi}_{\delta a} - \frac{3}{4} \hat{A}_\beta \delta_{ab} \hat{\psi}_\delta^b \right) \right] \\
&= \int d^5x \left(-\frac{1}{2} \right) \hat{e} \left\{ \left[\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \bar{\epsilon}^a + \frac{3}{4} \hat{A}_\alpha \delta^{ab} \bar{\epsilon}_b - \frac{il}{16} \bar{\epsilon}^a \left(\hat{\gamma}_\alpha^{\delta\sigma} + 4\delta_\alpha^\delta \hat{\gamma}^\sigma \right) \hat{F}_{\delta\sigma} - \frac{i}{2l} \delta^{ab} \bar{\epsilon}_b \hat{\gamma}_\alpha \right] \right. \\
&\quad \times \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} \left(\widehat{\nabla}_\beta \hat{\psi}_{\gamma a} - \frac{3}{4} \hat{A}_\beta \delta_{ac} \hat{\psi}_\gamma^c \right) \\
&\quad + \bar{\hat{\psi}}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \widehat{\nabla}_\beta \left[\widehat{\nabla}_\delta \hat{\epsilon}_a - \frac{3}{4} \hat{A}_\delta \delta_{ab} \hat{\epsilon}^j + \frac{il}{16} \left(\hat{\gamma}_\delta^{\gamma\sigma} - 4\delta_\delta^\gamma \hat{\gamma}^\sigma \right) \hat{\epsilon}_a \hat{F}_{\gamma\sigma} + \frac{i}{2l} \hat{\gamma}_\delta \delta_{ac} \hat{\epsilon}^c \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{3}{4} \delta_{ab} \bar{\hat{\psi}}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \hat{A}_\beta \left[\widehat{\nabla}_\delta \hat{\epsilon}^b + \frac{3}{4} \hat{A}_\delta \delta^{bc} \hat{\epsilon}_c + \frac{il}{16} \left(\hat{\gamma}_\delta^{\gamma\sigma} - 4\delta_\delta^\gamma \hat{\gamma}^\sigma \right) \hat{\epsilon}^b \hat{F}_{\gamma\sigma} - \frac{i}{2l} \hat{\gamma}_\delta \delta^{bc} \hat{\epsilon}_c \right] \\
&\quad \left. + \dots \right\} \\
&= \int d^5x \hat{e} \left[\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \left(\bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \widehat{\nabla}_\beta \hat{\psi}_{\delta a} \right) + \left(\hat{R}_\alpha^\beta - \frac{1}{2} \hat{R} \delta_\alpha^\beta \right) \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^\alpha \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{3}{4} \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \left(\delta^{ab} \hat{A}_\beta \bar{\epsilon}_a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \hat{\psi}_{\delta b} \right) + \frac{3}{4} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \hat{\psi}_\alpha^b \delta_{ab} \hat{F}_{\beta\delta} \\
&\quad + \frac{il}{16} \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \left(\hat{F}_{\gamma\sigma} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}_\delta^{\gamma\sigma} \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \right) - \frac{il}{8} \hat{F}_{\gamma\sigma} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^{\beta\delta\gamma\sigma} \left(\widehat{\nabla}_\beta \hat{\psi}_\delta \right)_a + \frac{3il}{4} \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \bar{\epsilon}^a \left(\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \hat{\psi}_\beta \right)_a \\
&\quad + \frac{3il}{32} \hat{F}_{\gamma\sigma} \hat{A}_\alpha \delta_{ab} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma} \hat{\psi}_\beta^b - \frac{9il}{16} \delta_{ab} \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{A}_\alpha \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\psi}_\beta^b \\
&\quad + \frac{il}{4} \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \left(\bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^\sigma \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \hat{\psi}_\beta^a \hat{F}_{\rho\sigma} \right) + \frac{il}{2} \hat{F}_{\alpha\gamma} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta\gamma} \left(\widehat{\nabla}_\beta \hat{\psi}_\delta \right)_a - \frac{3il}{8} \hat{F}_{\alpha\gamma} \hat{A}_\beta \delta_{ab} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta\gamma} \hat{\psi}_\delta^b \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{3i}{2l} \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \left(\bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\psi}_\beta^b \right) - \frac{3i}{l} \delta^{ab} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \hat{\psi}_\beta^b - \frac{9i}{4l} \hat{A}_\alpha \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \right]. \tag{186}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that in above and the following calculations, we take into account only the terms which are at most quadratic in terms of the fermionic quantities.

Further, the supersymmetric variation of the gravitino mass-like term is

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta S_{\text{GM}} &= \delta \left[\frac{3i}{4l} \int d^4x \hat{e} \bar{\hat{\psi}}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\psi}_\beta^b \delta_{ab} \right] \\
&= \frac{3i}{4l} \int d^5x \hat{e} \left\{ \left[\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \bar{\epsilon}^a + \frac{3}{4} \hat{A}_\alpha \delta^{ac} \bar{\epsilon}_c - \frac{il}{16} \bar{\epsilon}^a \left(\hat{\gamma}_\alpha^{\tau\sigma} + 4\delta_\alpha^\tau \hat{\gamma}^\sigma \right) \hat{F}_{\tau\sigma} - \frac{i}{2l} \delta^{ac} \bar{\epsilon}_c \hat{\gamma}_\alpha \right] \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\psi}_\beta^b \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \bar{\psi}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \left[\widehat{\nabla}_\beta \hat{\epsilon}^b + \frac{3}{4} \hat{A}_\beta \delta^{bd} \hat{\epsilon}_d + \frac{il}{16} (\hat{\gamma}_\beta^{\tau\sigma} - 4\delta_\nu^{\tau\sigma} \hat{\gamma}^\sigma) \hat{\epsilon}^b \hat{F}_{\tau\sigma} - \frac{i}{2l} \hat{\gamma}_\beta \delta^{bd} \hat{\epsilon}_d \right] \Big\} \delta_{ab} \\
& = \int d^5 x \hat{e} \left[\frac{3i}{2l} (\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \bar{\epsilon}^a) \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\psi}_\beta^b \delta_{ab} - \frac{9i}{8} \hat{A}_\alpha \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{3}{16} \delta_{ab} \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}_\alpha \hat{\psi}_\beta^b - \frac{3}{16} \delta_{ab} \hat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \hat{\psi}_\delta^b - \frac{3}{l^2} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^\alpha \hat{\psi}_{\alpha a} \right] \quad (187)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the supersymmetric variation of the interaction terms of the gravitino and graviphoton produces

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta S_{\text{GG}} & = \delta \int d^5 x \hat{e} \left(-\frac{3il}{32} \right) \left(\bar{\psi}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \hat{F}_{\gamma\delta} + 2 \bar{\psi}_\alpha^a \hat{\psi}_a^\beta \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \right) \\
& = -\frac{3il}{32} \int d^5 x \hat{e} \left\{ \hat{F}_{\gamma\delta} \left(\left[\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \bar{\epsilon}^a + \frac{3}{4} \hat{A}_\alpha \delta^{ac} \bar{\epsilon}_c - \frac{il}{16} \bar{\epsilon}^a (\hat{\gamma}_\alpha^{\tau\sigma} + 4\delta_\alpha^{\tau\sigma} \hat{\gamma}^\sigma) \hat{F}_{\tau\sigma} - \frac{i}{2l} \delta^{ac} \bar{\epsilon}_c \hat{\gamma}_\alpha \right] \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \bar{\psi}_\alpha^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \left[\widehat{\nabla}_\delta \hat{\epsilon}_a - \frac{3}{4} \hat{A}_\delta \delta_{ab} \hat{\epsilon}^b + \frac{il}{16} (\hat{\gamma}_\delta^{\tau\sigma} - 4\delta_\delta^{\tau\sigma} \hat{\gamma}^\sigma) \hat{\epsilon}_a \hat{F}_{\tau\sigma} + \frac{i}{2l} \hat{\gamma}_\delta \delta_{ab} \hat{\epsilon}^b \right] \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + 2 \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \left(\left[\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \bar{\epsilon}^a + \frac{3}{4} \hat{A}_\alpha \delta^{ac} \bar{\epsilon}_c - \frac{il}{16} \bar{\epsilon}^a (\hat{\gamma}_\alpha^{\gamma\sigma} + 4\delta_\alpha^{\gamma\sigma} \hat{\gamma}^\sigma) \hat{F}_{\gamma\sigma} - \frac{i}{2l} \delta^{ac} \bar{\epsilon}_c \hat{\gamma}_\alpha \right] \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \bar{\psi}_\alpha^a \left[\widehat{\nabla}_\beta \hat{\epsilon}_a - \frac{3}{4} \hat{A}_\beta \delta_{ab} \hat{\epsilon}^b + \frac{il}{16} (\hat{\gamma}_\beta^{\gamma\sigma} - 4\delta_\beta^{\gamma\sigma} \hat{\gamma}^\sigma) \hat{\epsilon}_a \hat{F}_{\gamma\sigma} + \frac{i}{2l} \hat{\gamma}_\beta \delta_{ac} \hat{\epsilon}^c \right] \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \dots \right\} \\
& = \int d^5 x \hat{e} \left[-\frac{3il}{8} (\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \bar{\epsilon})^a \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{9il}{32} \delta^{ab} \hat{A}_\alpha \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \bar{\epsilon}_a \hat{\psi}_{\beta b} \right. \\
& \quad - \frac{3il}{16} (\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \bar{\epsilon})^a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \hat{F}_{\gamma\delta} - \frac{9il}{64} \hat{A}_\alpha \hat{F}_{\gamma\delta} \delta^{ab} \bar{\epsilon}_a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \hat{\psi}_{\beta b} \\
& \quad + \frac{3l^2}{64} \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^\delta \hat{\psi}_{\delta a} + \frac{3l^2}{64} \hat{e}^{-1} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma} \hat{F}_{\alpha\beta} \hat{F}_{\gamma\delta} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\psi}_{\sigma a} \\
& \quad + \frac{3l^2}{32} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^\delta \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \hat{F}^{\beta\gamma} \hat{F}_{\gamma\delta} - \frac{3l^2}{32} \bar{\epsilon}^a \hat{\gamma}^\delta \hat{\psi}_{\beta a} \hat{F}_{\alpha\delta} \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{3}{16} \delta^{ab} \bar{\epsilon}_a \hat{\gamma}_\alpha \hat{\psi}_{\beta b} \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} + \frac{3}{16} \delta^{ab} \bar{\epsilon}_a \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} \hat{\psi}_{\alpha b} \hat{F}_{\beta\delta} \right]. \quad (188)
\end{aligned}$$

In above calculation, the following definitions and algebraic operations are repeatedly used,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta} & = \frac{1}{2} [\hat{\gamma}_\alpha, \hat{\gamma}_\beta], \quad \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta} = -\frac{1}{2!} \hat{e}^{-1} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma\tau} \hat{\gamma}_{\sigma\tau}, \\
\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma} & = \hat{e}^{-1} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma\tau} \hat{\gamma}_\tau, \quad \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma\tau} = \hat{e} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma\tau}. \\
\hat{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta} \hat{\gamma}_{\delta\sigma} & = \hat{e} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma} \hat{\gamma}^\sigma - (\hat{g}_{\alpha\delta} \hat{g}_{\beta\sigma} - \hat{g}_{\alpha\sigma} \hat{g}_{\beta\delta}), \\
\hat{\gamma}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}_{\beta\delta} & = \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta\delta} + \hat{g}_{\alpha\beta} \hat{\gamma}_\delta - \hat{g}_{\alpha\delta} \hat{\gamma}_\beta. \quad (189)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\psi}^a & = C^{-1} \Omega^{ab} \bar{\psi}_b^T = C^{-1} \bar{\psi}^{aT}, \quad \bar{\psi}^a = -\hat{\psi}^{aT} C, \\
\bar{\psi}^a \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} \hat{\chi}_a & = -\hat{\psi}^{aT} C \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} C^{-1} \bar{\chi}_a^T \\
& = \begin{cases} -\hat{\psi}^{aT} \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} \bar{\chi}_a^T = \bar{\chi}_a \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} \hat{\psi}^a = -\bar{\chi}^a \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} \hat{\psi}_a, & n = 0, 1, 4, 5, \\ \hat{\psi}^{aT} \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} \bar{\chi}_a^T = -\bar{\chi}_a \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} \hat{\psi}^a = \bar{\chi}^a \hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} \hat{\psi}_a, & n = 2, 3, \end{cases} \quad (190)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta}\widehat{\nabla}_\beta\widehat{\nabla}_\delta\hat{\chi}_a &= \frac{1}{2}\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta}[\widehat{\nabla}_\beta,\widehat{\nabla}_\delta]\hat{\chi}_a = \frac{1}{8}\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta}\hat{R}_{\beta\delta mn}\hat{\gamma}^{mn}\hat{\chi}_a \\
&= \frac{1}{8}\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta}\hat{R}_{\beta\delta\sigma\tau}\hat{\gamma}^{\sigma\tau}\hat{\chi}_a = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\gamma}^\beta\left(-\hat{R}_\beta^\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\delta_\beta^\alpha\hat{R}\right)\hat{\chi}_a.
\end{aligned} \tag{191}$$

We have also employed the Ricci and Bianchi identities for the Riemannian curvature tensor and $U(1)$ gauge field strength in five-dimensional curved space-time,

$$\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma}\hat{R}_{\tau\gamma\delta\sigma} = 0, \quad \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma}\widehat{\nabla}_\beta\hat{R}_{\delta\sigma\tau\kappa} = 0, \quad \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma}\widehat{\nabla}_\beta\hat{F}_{\delta\sigma} = 0. \tag{192}$$

Moreover, due to the noncommutativity between $\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1\cdots\alpha_n}$, we have repeatedly performed the following operations in the calculation,

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1\cdots\alpha_n}\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha(\cdots) = \left[\hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1\cdots\alpha_n},\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha\right](\cdots) + \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha\left[\hat{\gamma}_{\alpha_1\cdots\alpha_n}(\cdots)\right]. \tag{193}$$

Specifically, we work in the inertial coordinate system, i.e., the Christoffel symbol $\hat{\Gamma}_{\beta\delta}^\alpha = 0$. Consequently, the metricity condition gives $\partial_\alpha\hat{e}_\beta^m = 0$ and further the modified spin connection

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\omega}_{\alpha mn} &= \frac{1}{2}\hat{e}_m^\beta(\partial_\alpha\hat{e}_{\beta n} - \partial_\beta\hat{e}_{\alpha n}) - \frac{1}{2}\hat{e}_n^\beta(\partial_\alpha\hat{e}_{\beta m} - \partial_\beta\hat{e}_{\alpha m}) - \frac{1}{2}\hat{e}_m^\delta\hat{e}_n^\sigma(\partial_\delta\hat{e}_{\sigma p} - \partial_\sigma\hat{e}_{\delta p})\hat{e}_\alpha^p \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4}\left(\bar{\psi}_\alpha^a\hat{\gamma}_m\hat{\psi}_{an} + \bar{\psi}_\alpha^a\hat{\gamma}_m\hat{\psi}_{an} - \bar{\psi}_\alpha^a\hat{\gamma}_n\hat{\psi}_{am}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{194}$$

has only quadratic fermionic terms.

Putting the supersymmetric variations (184) — (188) together, we obtain the total derivative terms,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta S &= \int d^5x \hat{e}\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha\left(-\hat{e}_m^\alpha\hat{e}_n^\beta\delta\hat{\omega}_\beta^{mn} - \frac{9il}{16}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\psi}_{\beta a}\hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta}\widehat{\nabla}_\beta\hat{\psi}_{\delta a} + \frac{3}{8}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta}\hat{\psi}_\delta^b\delta_{ab}\hat{A}_\beta\right. \\
&\quad \left.- \frac{3il}{32}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma}\hat{\psi}_{\beta a}\hat{F}_{\delta\sigma} + \frac{9}{4}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{\psi}_\beta^b\delta_{ab} + \frac{l^2}{32}\hat{e}^{-1}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\psi}_\sigma\hat{A}_\beta\hat{F}_{\gamma\delta}\right) \\
&= \int d^4x \int dr \partial_\alpha\left[\hat{e}\left(-\hat{e}_m^\alpha\hat{e}_n^\beta\delta\hat{\omega}_\beta^{mn} - \frac{9il}{16}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\psi}_{\beta a}\hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta}\widehat{\nabla}_\beta\hat{\psi}_{\delta a} + \frac{3}{8}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta}\hat{\psi}_\delta^b\delta_{ab}\hat{A}_\beta\right.\right. \\
&\quad \left.\left.- \frac{3il}{32}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma}\hat{\psi}_{\beta a}\hat{F}_{\delta\sigma} + \frac{9}{4}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{\psi}_\beta^b\delta_{ab} + \frac{l^2}{32}\hat{e}^{-1}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\sigma}\bar{\epsilon}^a\hat{\psi}_\sigma\hat{A}_\beta\hat{F}_{\gamma\delta}\right)\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{195}$$

In the following we take these total derivative terms near AdS_5 boundary. Substituting the asymptotical forms listed in (60) – (71) of on-shell fields and supersymmetry transformation parameters as well as $\hat{\gamma}$ -matrices into (195), one can see that the above supersymmetry variation is IR divergent due to the infinite AdS_5 boundary ($r \rightarrow 0$). Therefore, as the case of evaluating Weyl anomaly, we must perform holographic renormalization: integrating over the radial coordinate to the cut-off $r = \epsilon > 0$, introducing the counterterm and then taking the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ to remove the regulator. The finite ambiguity in adding the counter term is fixed by the four-dimensional Poincaré supersymmetry. During this process the super-Weyl symmetry is violated and the corresponding super-Weyl anomaly arises. But we can use a shortcut to extract out this super-Weyl anomaly. We use the induced metric

$$g_{\mu\nu}(x) = \frac{l^2}{\epsilon^2} \widehat{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, \epsilon) \Big|_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \quad (196)$$

on AdS_5 boundary rather than $g_{\mu\nu}(x, \epsilon)$ [5,98]. In this way we can directly take the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit and find that the non-vanishing contribution comes only from the term $\widehat{e}^{-1} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\delta\sigma\tau} \widehat{\epsilon}^a \widehat{\gamma}_\tau \widehat{\psi}_{\beta a} \widehat{F}_{\delta\sigma}$. We obtain [26]

$$\delta S = \frac{3il^3}{8 \times 32\pi G^{(5)}} \int d^4x \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} F_{\nu\lambda} \bar{\eta} \gamma_\rho \chi_\mu, \quad (197)$$

where χ_μ is the Majorana spinor constructed from the left-handed spinor χ_μ^L given in (70).

The non-vanishing term in Eq. (197) definitely gives the holographic super-Weyl anomaly since it is proportional to the conformal supersymmetry transformation parameter η . Substituting the explicit form (70) of χ_μ into (197), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S &= \int d^4x \bar{\eta} \gamma^\mu s_\mu \\ &= -\frac{l^3}{8 \times 16\pi G^{(5)}} \int d^4x \left[F^{\mu\nu} D_\mu \psi_\nu + \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \gamma_5 F_{\mu\nu} D_\lambda \psi_\rho + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^{\mu\nu} F_{\nu\lambda} (D_\mu \psi^\lambda - D^\lambda \psi_\mu) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (198)$$

where the γ -matrix algebraic relations are used, $\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu = g^{\mu\nu} - i\gamma^{\mu\nu}$, $\gamma_5 \gamma^{\mu\nu} = i\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \gamma_{\lambda\rho}/2$. Eq. (intermerela) gives the gauge field part of the super-Weyl anomaly of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(N)$ supersymmetric gauge theory at the leading-order of large- N expansion,

$$\gamma^\mu s_\mu = \frac{N^2}{64\pi^2} \left[F^{\mu\nu} D_\mu \psi_\nu + \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \gamma_5 F_{\mu\nu} D_\lambda \psi_\rho + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^{\mu\nu} F_{\nu\lambda} (D_\mu \psi^\lambda - D^\lambda \psi_\mu) \right]. \quad (199)$$

The super-Weyl anomaly of $\mathcal{N} = 2(4)$ supersymmetric gauge field theory in external conformal superconformal supergravity background should be derived from on-shell action of $\mathcal{N} = 4(8)$ $SU(2) \times U(1)$ ($SO(6)$) gauged supergravity near AdS_5 vacuum configuration in a similar way, but the concrete calculation on the supersymmetry variation is extremely complicated.

E. Concluding Remarks on Holographic Superconformal Anomaly

We have shown how the superconformal anomaly multiplet of a supersymmetric gauge theory in a classical conformal supergravity background can be reproduced from on-shell gauged supergravity via the AdS/CFT correspondence. It is amazing that these three distinct anomalies can be extracted out in the framework of a five-dimensional gauged supergravity. However, only partial results listed in Eq. (10) are reproduced from gauged supergravity. For example, Eqs. (160) and (199) show that only the gauged field part of chiral- and super-Weyl anomalies arise holographically from gauged supergravity ⁶. The reason for the

⁶The holographic chiral R -symmetry anomaly in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM receives no contribution from gravitational background due to its nice field content [29]. Thus the gauge field CS term is

failure of revealing this gravitational part is that the five-dimensional gauged supergravity (or the type IIB supergravity in $AdS_5 \times X^5$ background) is only the lowest approximation to the type IIB superstring theory in $AdS_5 \times X^5$ background. Thus it is possible that the gravitational part cannot be revealed within the five-dimensional gauged supergravity itself, and one must consider the higher-order gravitational action such as the Gauss-Bonnet term generated from the superstring theory [27]. It was found that in Ref. [28] that for an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $USp(2N)$ supersymmetric gauge theory coupled to two hypermultiplets in the fundamental and antisymmetric tensor representations of the gauge group, the gravitational background part of its holographic chiral R-symmetry anomaly does come from a mixed CS term in a gauged supergravity with higher order gravitational correction. Specifically, this CS term originates from the compactification on S^3 of the Wess-Zumino term describing the interaction of the R-R 4-form field with eight $D7$ -branes and one orientifold 7-plane system in type IIB superstring. In particular, this gravitational background term is at the subleading N order rather than the leading N^2 order in the large- N expansion.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the essence of the holographic anomaly is the anomaly inflow from the bulk theory to the AdS_5 boundary [30].

V. INTERNAL SUPERCONFORMAL ANOMALY FROM D -BRANE DYNAMICS AND REFLECTION IN BRANE SOLUTION OF TYPE II SUPERGRAVITY

A. Fractional Brane as the Origin of Internal Superconformal Anomaly in Low-energy Brane Dynamics

In this section, we shall try to understand the gravity dual of the internal superconformal anomaly. As stated in Sect. II, this type of superconformal anomaly originates from the dynamics of supersymmetric gauge theory itself. It has nothing to do with the external background field and its coefficient is proportional to the beta function of the theory. Therefore, the gravity dual of this type of superconformal anomaly should have no holographic meaning and we should go to the string origin of a supersymmetric gauge theory to look for its gravity dual.

As stated in Introduction, a supersymmetric theory can be obtained through D -brane engineering in weakly coupled type-II superstring, i.e., placing a stack of $D3$ -branes (maybe several types of D -branes) in a background space-time [33] Thus any dynamical phenomenon like the anomaly of a supersymmetric gauge theory should originate from certain brane configuration setting-up. We will see that the internal superconformal conformal anomaly actually relates to the fractional D -brane fixed at the singularity of a singular background space-time. On the other hand, in strong coupled type II superstring theory, Dp -branes appear as a p -brane solutions to type II supergravity, i.e., space-time background to type

fully responsible for the holographic origin of the chiral R-symmetry anomaly. This also explains the absence of the $R_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}R^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}$ term in the holographic Weyl anomaly of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM found in Ref. [5]. For $\mathcal{N} = 1, 2$ supersymmetric gauge theories the gravitational background part should holographically arise from the supergravity side.

II superstring or type II supergravity. Therefore, we can observe how the existence of D-branes modify the space-time background and further investigate how this modification affect the supergravity in this space-time background to find the dual description to the internal superconformal anomaly. In the following we shall reveal how the internal superconformal anomaly is embodied in the construction of a D -brane configuration.

Since a Dp -brane is characterized by open strings ending on it. The low-energy dynamics of a Dp -brane system describes the dynamical behavior of open string modes trapped on world-volume of Dp -branes and their interaction with bulk supergravity. The corresponding effective action consists of two parts. One is the Dirac-Born-Infeld (DBI) action (in Einstein framework) and it describes the interaction between Dp -branes and NS-NS fields of type II superstring,

$$S_{\text{DBI}} = -\tau_p \int_{V_{p+1}} d^{p+1}x e^{(p-3)\phi/4} \text{Tr} \sqrt{-\det [g_{\mu\nu} + e^{-\phi/2} (B_{\mu\nu} + 2\pi\alpha' F_{\mu\nu})]}. \quad (200)$$

$\mu, \nu = 0, \dots, p;$

The other one represents the interaction of Dp -branes with R-R fields described by the topological Wess-Zumino (WZ) term,

$$S_{\text{WZ}} = \mu_p \int_{V_{p+1}} [C \wedge \text{Tr} (e^{B+2\pi\alpha' F})]_{p+1}. \quad (201)$$

In above equations, the parameters τ_p and μ_p are the tension and R-R charge of a Dp -brane, which are actually equal because of the BPS-saturation property of a Dp -brane,

$$\tau_p = \mu_p = \frac{T_p}{\kappa_{10}} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^p \alpha'^{(1+p)/2}}, \quad T_p = \sqrt{\pi} (2\pi\sqrt{\alpha'})^{3-p}; \quad (202)$$

The gravitational coupling κ_{10} is related to the ten-dimensional Newtonian constant $G_{N(10)}$ derived from closed string, $2\kappa_{10}^2 = 16\pi G_{N(10)} = (2\pi)^7 g_s^2 \alpha'^4$. $F_{\mu\nu}$ is the strength of gauge field living on Dp -brane world-volume; $G_{\mu\nu}$, $B_{\mu\nu}$ and $C_{\mu_1\mu_2\dots\mu_n}$ are the pull-backs of ten-dimensional bulk metric G_{MN} , the antisymmetric NS-NS field $B_{(2)MN}$ and R-R fields $C_{M_1\dots M_n}$ to the $p+1$ -dimensional world-volume,

$$g_{\mu\nu} = G_{MN} \partial_\mu X^M \partial_\nu X^N, \quad B_{\mu\nu} = B_{MN} \partial_\mu X^M \partial_\nu X^N, \\ C_{\mu_1\mu_2\dots\mu_n} = C_{M_1M_2\dots M_n} \partial_{\mu_1} X^{M_1} \partial_{\mu_2} X^{M_2} \dots \partial_{\mu_n} X^{M_n}, \quad n \leq p+1; \quad (203)$$

Finally, the trace operation takes over certain representation of gauge group.

Now let us see how the superconformal anomaly is covered in the D -brane configuration. First, when the transverse space like conifold or orbifold has singularity, the closed string states consist of both the untwisted and twisted sectors [101]. The fractional Dp -branes frozen at the singular point of transverse space are identical to the $D(p+2)$ -branes wrapped on two-cycle $\mathcal{C}_2$ like S^2 and the singular point can be considered as a vanishing two-cycle⁷. The fields corresponding to the twisted string states emitted by fractional Dp -branes should

⁷A roughly explanation is the following [102]: the fixed point in orbifold R^4/Γ for $\Gamma = Z_2$ or $Z_2 \times Z_2$

locate at the singular point of target space-time. Based on the viewpoint that a Dp -brane is considered as a wrapped $D(p+2)$ -brane, the twisted fields decompose into two parts, one part living on the $p+1$ -dimensional world-volume of fractional Dp -brane, and the other on the blow-up of the vanishing two-cycle $\mathcal{C}_2$,

$$V_{p+3} = V_{p+1} \times \mathcal{C}_2, \quad B_{(2)} = b(x)\omega_2, \quad C_{(p+3)} = C_{(p+1)} \wedge \omega_2. \quad (204)$$

In above equation ω_2 is the differential two-form defined on the blow-up of the vanishing 2-cycle, the twisted scalar field $b(x)$ and the pull-back $c_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_{p+1}}$ of R-R antisymmetric tensor fields live on the $p+1$ -dimensional world-volume of Dp -branes. Substituting the fields in (204) into the DBI action (200) and WZ term (201) and expanding them to the quadratic terms of the gauge field strength, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & S_{\text{DBI}} + S_{\text{WZ}} \\ &= -\tau_{p+2} \int_{V_{p+1}} d^{p+1}x e^{(p-3)\phi/4} \text{Tr} \sqrt{-\det(g_{\mu\nu} + 2\pi\alpha' e^{-\phi/2} F_{\mu\nu})} \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} B_{(2)} \\ &+ \mu_{p+2} \left[\int_{V_{p+1}} C_{(p+1)} \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} C_{(2)} + \frac{1}{2} (2\pi\alpha')^2 \int_{V_{p+1}} C_{(p-3)} \wedge \text{Tr}(F \wedge F) \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} C_{(2)} \right. \\ &+ \left. \int_{V_{p+1}} C_{(p+1)} \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} B_{(2)} + \frac{1}{2} (2\pi\alpha')^2 \int_{V_{p+1}} C_{(p-3)} \wedge \text{Tr}(F \wedge F) \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} B_{(2)} + \dots \right] \\ &= S_{\text{brane-bulk}} + S_{\text{gauge}}, \end{aligned} \quad (205)$$

where $S_{\text{brane-bulk}}$ is the action describing the interaction of fractional Dp -brane with bulk fields and S_{gauge} gives the gauge field action on the world-volume of the Dp -brane,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{brane-bulk}} &= -\tau_p \int_{V_{p+1}} d^{p+1}x e^{(p-3)\phi/4} \sqrt{-g} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sqrt{\alpha'})^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} B_{(2)} \\ &+ \mu_p \left[\int_{V_{p+1}} C_{(p+1)} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sqrt{\alpha'})^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} C_{(2)} + \int_{V_{p+1}} C_{(p+1)} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sqrt{\alpha'})^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} B_{(2)} \right] + \dots; \\ S_{\text{gauge}} &= -\alpha' \tau_p \int_{V_{p+1}} d^{p+1}x e^{(p-3)\phi/4} \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}(F^{\lambda\rho} F_{\lambda\rho}) \right] e^{-\phi} \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} B_{(2)} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \alpha' \mu_p \left[\int_{V_{p+1}} \text{Tr}(F \wedge F) \wedge C_{(p-3)} \left(\int_{\mathcal{C}_2} C_{(2)} + \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} B_{(2)} \right) \right] + \dots, \\ &\mu, \nu = 0, \dots, p; \quad \alpha, \beta = 0, \dots, p, a, b; \end{aligned} \quad (206)$$

where $a, b = 1, 2$ are the indices on the vanishing 2-cycle $\mathcal{C}_2$. Note that in Eqs. (205) and (206) we choose $X^I = \text{Constant}$ ($I = p+1, \dots, 9$) for the convenience of discussion, and

and the apex of conifold with base $T^{1,1} = S^5/Z_2$ are singular limits of ALE spaces. Usually an ALE space contains compact 2-cycles, which shrinks to zero size at the fixed point of orbifold. Specifically, the McKay correspondence theorem states that the simple root α_I of simply-laced Lie algebra has one-to-one correspondence with a 2-cycle in any ALE space and that especially the root corresponds to an irreducible representation of Γ . On the other hand, the fractional brane, as a boundary state of closed string theory, constitutes an irreducible of Γ . Therefore, a connection between the fractional brane and a vanishing 2-cycle can be established.

hence the pull-back G_{IJ} to world volume vanishes. Recalling the relation between the gauge couplings and string couplings,

$$\frac{4i\pi}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} + \frac{\theta^{(\text{CP})}}{2\pi} = ie^{-\phi} + \frac{C_{(0)}}{2\pi}, \quad (207)$$

and comparing Eq. (206) (in the case of $p = 3$) with Eqs. (11)–(13) we can see that it is the NS-NS- and R-R two-form fluxes $\int_{\mathcal{C}_2} B_{(2)}$, $\int_{\mathcal{C}_2} C_{(2)}$ carried by fractional branes through the shrunken 2-cycle that have created the running of gauge coupling and the shift of θ -angle and consequently lead to the internal superconformal anomaly of a supersymmetric gauge theory. Therefore, we conclude that the fractional branes frozen at the singular point of background space-time is the origin of superconformal anomaly of a supersymmetric gauge theory in brane configuration.

This observation can be made more explicitly and quantitatively by the brane probe technique [102,103].

A concrete example is a $D3$ -brane configuration in type IIB superstring theory. It consists of N $D3$ -branes and M fractional $D3$ -branes in a target space-time $M^4 \times \mathcal{C}_6$. $\mathcal{C}_6$ is a conifold with base $T^{1,1} = [SU(2) \times SU(2)]/U(1)$, which is a Calabi-Yau threefold and has $SU(3)$ holonomy. The apex of $\mathcal{C}_6$ is a singular point in background space-time. Therefore, one can put not only a stack of N $D3$ -branes moving freely in the transverse space, but also a stack of M fractional $D3$ -branes fixed at the singularity. All these $D3$ -branes extend in four-dimensional Minkowski space-time M^4 . Topologically $T^{1,1} \sim S^2 \times S^3$, those fractional $D3$ -branes can be considered as $D5$ -branes wrapped around the vanished two-cycle S^2 at the apex of $\mathcal{C}_6$. The supersymmetric gauge theory coming from this brane configuration is just the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ supersymmetric gauge theory with two flavors matter chiral superfields in the bifundamental representations $(N+M, \overline{N})$ and $(N, \overline{N+M})$. The superconformal anomaly multiplet listed in Eqs. (36), (39) and (40) shows that the anomaly coefficient is indeed proportional M , the number of $D3$ -fractional branes. This confirms that the fractional brane is origin of the internal superconformal anomaly in brane engineering.

B. Modification on Brane Solution to Type Supergravity and Symmetry Breaking by Fractional Brane

1. Deformation on $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ Background by Fractional $D3$ -branes

Since in the strongly coupled type II superstring theory, a stack of Dp -branes behaves as a p -brane solution to type supergravity, the existence of fractional branes in brane configuration definitely modifies the p -brane solution produced by bulk Dp -branes. In the following we still take above example in type IIB superstring — the N $D3$ -branes and M fractional $D3$ -branes in the space-time background $M^4 \times \mathcal{C}_6$ — to expound how the fractional $D3$ -branes modify three-brane solutions of type IIB supergravity and hence give rise to the symmetry breaking in the geometric background described by three-brane solution.

We first consider the case without fractional $D3$ -branes, i.e, the case of $M = 0$. The three-brane solution to type IIB supergravity takes the following form,

$$\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= H^{-1/2}(r)\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + H^{1/2}(r)\left(dr^2 + r^2 ds_{T^{1,1}}^2\right), \\
F_{(5)} &= \mathcal{F}_{(5)} + \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{(5)}, \\
\mathcal{F}_{(5)} &= \frac{1}{4}\pi\alpha'^2 N g^1 \wedge g^2 \wedge g^3 \wedge g^4 \wedge g^5 = \frac{1}{2}\pi\alpha'^2 N \omega^2 \wedge \omega^3, \\
H(r) &= 1 + \frac{L^4}{r^4}, \quad L^4 = \frac{27\pi g_s N(\alpha')^2}{4}, \\
ds_{T^{1,1}}^2 &= \frac{1}{9}(\sigma^{\tilde{3}} + \sigma^{\hat{3}})^2 + \frac{1}{6}\sum_{\tilde{i}=1}^2(\sigma^{\tilde{i}})^2 + \frac{1}{6}\sum_{\hat{i}=1}^2(\sigma^{\hat{i}})^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{9}(g^5)^2 + \frac{1}{6}\sum_{m=1}^4(g^m)^2, \\
\omega_2 &= \frac{1}{2}\left(g^1 \wedge g^2 + g^3 \wedge g^4\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\sin\theta_1 d\theta_1 \wedge d\phi_1 - \sin\theta_2 d\theta_2 \wedge d\phi_2\right), \\
\omega_3 &= g^5 \wedge \omega_2, \\
\int_{S^2}\omega_2 &= 4\pi, \quad \int_{S^3}\omega_3 = 8\pi^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{208}$$

In above equations, the basis g^m are one-form basis on $T^{1,1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
g^1 &\equiv \frac{\sigma^{\tilde{1}} - \sigma^{\hat{1}}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad g^2 \equiv \frac{\sigma^{\tilde{2}} - \sigma^{\hat{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad g^3 \equiv \frac{\sigma^{\tilde{1}} + \sigma^{\hat{1}}}{\sqrt{2}}, \\
g^4 &\equiv \frac{\sigma^{\tilde{2}} + \sigma^{\hat{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad g^5 \equiv \sigma^{\tilde{3}} + \sigma^{\hat{3}},
\end{aligned} \tag{209}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^{\tilde{1}} &\equiv \sin\theta_1 d\phi_1, \quad \sigma^{\hat{1}} \equiv \cos 2\beta \sin\theta_2 d\phi_2 - \sin 2\beta d\theta_2, \\
\sigma^{\tilde{2}} &\equiv d\theta_1, \quad \sigma^{\hat{2}} \equiv \sin 2\beta \sin\theta_2 d\phi_2 + \cos 2\beta d\theta_2, \\
\sigma^{\tilde{3}} &\equiv \cos\theta_1 d\phi_1, \quad \sigma^{\hat{3}} \equiv 2d\beta + \cos\theta_2 d\phi_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{210}$$

All other fields in this solution vanish. Near the horizon limit $r \rightarrow 0$, Eq. (208) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
ds_{10}^2 &= \frac{r^2}{L^2}\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + \frac{L^2}{r^2}dr^2 + L^2 ds_{T^{1,1}}^2, \\
F_{(5)} &= \mathcal{F}_{(5)} + \star \mathcal{F}_{(5)} \\
&= \frac{r^3}{g_s L^4} dx^0 \wedge dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 \wedge dr + \frac{L^4}{27g_s} g^1 \wedge g^2 \wedge g^3 \wedge g^4 \wedge g^5, \\
L^2 &= \frac{3\sqrt{3}\pi g_s N \alpha'}{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{211}$$

It is exactly the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ space-time background for type IIB superstring. This leads to the correspondence between type IIB superstring in $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background and $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(N) \times SU(N)$ supersymmetric gauge theory with two flavors in bifundamental representations $(N, \bar{N})$ and $(\bar{N}, N)$ at the fixed point of its renormalization group flow.

When those M $D3$ fractional branes are switched on at the apex of the conifold, the resultant background to type IIB superstring is the celebrated solution to type IIB supergravity found by Klebanov and Strassler [49]. This solution is composed of not only the ten-dimensional space-time metric, the self-dual five-form field strength $\hat{F}_{(5)}$, but also the NS-NS- and R-R two-forms, $B_{(2)}$ and $C_{(2)}$ living only on $T^{1,1} \sim S^2 \times S^3$,

$$\begin{aligned}
ds_{10}^2 &= h^{-1/2}(\tau) dx_{1,3}^2 + h^{1/2}(\tau) ds_6^2, \\
\hat{F}_{(5)} &= \mathcal{F}_{(5)} + \tilde{F}_{(5)}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{(5)} = dx^0 \wedge dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 \wedge dh^{-1}, \\
B_{(2)} &= \frac{g_s M \alpha'}{2} \left[f(\tau) g^1 \wedge g^2 + k(\tau) g^3 \wedge g^4 \right], \\
F_{(3)} &= \frac{M \alpha'}{2} \left\{ g^3 \wedge g^4 \wedge g^5 + d \left[F(\tau) (g^1 \wedge g^3 + g^2 \wedge g^4) \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{212}$$

In this solution $h(\tau)$ is the warp factor, ds_6^2 is the metric of deformed conifold [49,105],

$$\begin{aligned}
ds_6^2 &= \frac{1}{2} (12)^{1/3} K(\tau) \left\{ \frac{1}{3[K(\tau)]^3} \left[d\tau^2 + (g^5)^2 \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sinh^2 \left(\frac{\tau}{2} \right) \left[(g^1)^2 + (g^2)^2 \right] + \cosh^2 \left(\frac{\tau}{2} \right) \left[(g^3)^2 + (g^4)^2 \right] \right\}, \\
K(\tau) &= \frac{(\sinh 2\tau - 2\tau)^{1/3}}{2^{1/3} \sinh \tau}, \\
F(\tau) &= \frac{\sinh \tau - \tau}{2 \sinh \tau}, \\
f(\tau) &= \frac{\tau \coth \tau - 1}{2 \sinh \tau} (\cosh \tau - 1), \\
k(\tau) &= \frac{\tau \coth \tau - 1}{2 \sinh \tau} (\cosh \tau + 1), \\
h(\tau) &= C (g_s M)^2 \frac{2^{2/3}}{4} \int_{\tau}^{\infty} dx \frac{x \coth x - 1}{\sinh^2 x} [\sinh(2x) - 2x]^{1/3},
\end{aligned} \tag{213}$$

C is the normalization constant. In the small τ limit, $h(\tau \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow (g_s M)^2$, the background for ten-dimensional type IIB supergravity is approximately the $M^4 \times$ deformed conifold,

$$\begin{aligned}
ds_{10}^2|_{\tau \rightarrow 0} &\rightarrow (g_s M)^{-1} \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + g_s M \left(\frac{1}{2} d\tau^2 + d\Omega_3^2 + \frac{1}{4} \tau^2 [(g^1)^2 + (g^2)^2] \right), \\
F(\tau \rightarrow 0) &\rightarrow 0, \quad F_{(3)}|_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \rightarrow M g^3 \wedge g^4 \wedge g^5, \\
f(\tau \rightarrow 0) &\rightarrow 0, \quad k(\tau \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0, \quad B_{(2)}|_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{214}$$

Therefore, this solution is non-singular since the apex of the conifold has been resolved by $F_{(3)}$ fluxes fractional brane [49], which prevents the three-cycle ($\sim S^3$) from shrinking to a point.

In large- τ case, the radial coordinate τ is relevant to the radial coordinate r as the following,

$$r^3 \sim 12^{1/2} e^\tau \quad \text{at large } \tau. \tag{215}$$

Consequently, the solution becomes the Klebanov-Tseytlin (K-T) solution [104],

$$\begin{aligned}
ds_{10}^2 &= h^{-1/2}(r)dx_{1,3}^2 + h^{1/2}(r)ds_6^2, \\
ds_6^2 &= dr^2 + r^2 ds_{T^{1,1}}^2, \\
h(r) &= \frac{27\pi(\alpha')^2}{4r^4} \left[g_s N + \frac{3}{2\pi} (g_s M)^2 \ln \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right) + \frac{3}{8\pi} (g_s M)^2 \right], \\
F_{(3)} &= dC_{(2)} = c(r)\omega_3, \quad B_{(2)} = b(r)\omega_2, \\
\mathcal{F}_{(5)} &= N_{\text{eff}}(r)\omega_2 \wedge \omega_3, \\
b(r) &= \frac{3g_s M \alpha'}{2} \ln \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right), \quad c(r) = \frac{M \alpha'}{2}, \\
N_{\text{eff}}(r) &= N + \frac{3}{2\pi} g_s M^2 \ln \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right), \quad C_{(2)} = M \alpha' \beta \omega_2 \quad (\text{locally}).
\end{aligned} \tag{216}$$

All other fields vanish. At large τ (or equivalently, large- r limit) the solution shows clearly that there are M units of R-R three-form fluxes passing through the 3-cycle S^3 of $T^{1,1}$.

On the field theory side, the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ supersymmetric gauge theory with two chiral superfields in the bifundamental representations $(N+M, \overline{N})$ and $(\overline{N+M}, N)$ is no longer a superconformal field theory. The zero point of its beta function is removed due to the existence of fractional branes.

In above subsection the origin of superconformal anomaly of the field theory is identified as the fractional D -branes in brane configuration. Therefore, we see that the K-S solution (212) furnishes a space-time background for type IIB superstring (or supergravity) and it can be considered as a deformation on the three-brane solution (208) obtained from above $D3$ -brane configuration without fractional $D3$ -branes. In the following we analyze the symmetry breaking reflected in the space-time geometry described by the K-S solution so that an quantitative investigation on the gravity dual of the superconformal anomaly can proceed.

2. Breaking of $U(1)$ Rotational Symmetry and Scale Symmetry in Transverse Space by Fractional Brane

Generally speaking, in a brane configuration, the scale symmetry and chiral R -symmetry of a supersymmetric gauge theory living on the world-volume of Dp -branes come from the geometrical scale- and rotation transformation invariance of transverse space,

$$x^I \longrightarrow \mu e^{i\alpha} x^I, \quad p+1 \leq I \leq 10. \tag{217}$$

The amount of supersymmetries in supersymmetric gauge theory depends on how many supersymmetries are preserved by such a brane configuration. Since a D -brane configuration is represented by a brane solution to supergravity, one can thus equivalently analyze the symmetry in the background geometry described by brane solution to observe the effects of fractional branes.

Based on this argument, let us observe the manifestation of the scale symmetry and $U(1) \cong SO(2)$ rotation symmetry in the K-S solution. First, in the case with no fractional branes ($M = 0$). The near-horizon limit of the three-brane solution is $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ listed

in (211). This solution shows explicitly that the scale symmetry is trivially present in the transverse space part and the $U(1)$ symmetry is reflected in the invariance under the following β -angle rotation,

$$\beta \longrightarrow \beta + \alpha. \quad (218)$$

When fractional $D3$ -branes switch on at the apex of $\mathcal{C}_6$, the solution (212) shows that near the horizon $r \rightarrow 0$ the metric ceases to be $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$. This is because that not only $h(r)$ and $F_{(5)}$ get additional logarithmic dependence,

$$\begin{aligned} h(r) &\sim \frac{1}{r^4} \left[C_1 + C_2 \ln \frac{r}{r_0} \right], \\ \hat{F}_5 &\sim \left[N + C_3 \ln \frac{r}{r_0} \right] [\omega_2 \wedge \omega_3 + \star(\omega_2 \wedge \omega_3)], \end{aligned} \quad (219)$$

but also the background fields $B_{(2)MN}$ and $C_{(2)MN}$ have been generated by the fractional brane fluxes. The coefficients C_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) in (219) can be extracted out from the solution (216).

It was analyzed in Ref. [1] that it is the non-invariance of $C_{(2)}$ under the β -angle rotation that leads to the chiral R-symmetry anomaly in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ gauge theory. A similar analysis can show that it is the non-invariance of $B_{(2)}$ under scale transformation in transverse space that results in the scale anomaly in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ gauge theory. Under the scale transformation $r \rightarrow \mu r$, the $B_{(2)}$ given in Eq. (212) transforms as

$$B_{(2)} \longrightarrow B_{(2)} + \frac{3g_s M \alpha'}{2} \omega_2 \ln \mu. \quad (220)$$

The relation between string coupling and gauge couplings of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ gauge theory [49,91] gives

$$\frac{1}{g_1^2} + \frac{1}{g_2^2} \sim e^{-\phi} \sim \frac{1}{g_s}, \quad \frac{1}{g_1^2} - \frac{1}{g_2^2} \sim e^{-\phi} \left[\int_{S^2} B_{(2)} - \frac{1}{2} \right], \quad (221)$$

so we have

$$\frac{1}{g_1^2} \sim \frac{1}{2g_s} \left[\int_{S^2} B_{(2)} - \frac{1}{2} \right], \quad \frac{1}{g_2^2} \sim \frac{1}{2g_s} \left[- \int_{S^2} B_{(2)} + \frac{3}{2} \right]. \quad (222)$$

Comparing Eq. (222) with Eq. (220), one can see that the variation of $B_{(2)}$ under scale transformation is relevant to β -functions of the $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ gauge couplings at the IR fixed point, [49],

$$\frac{d}{d(\ln \mu)} \frac{8\pi^2}{g_1^2(\mu)} \sim 3M, \quad \frac{d}{d(\ln \mu)} \frac{8\pi^2}{g_2^2(\mu)} \sim -3M. \quad (223)$$

Therefore, the scale anomaly coefficients of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(N+M) \times SU(M)$ gauge theory given in Eq. (39) is reproduced.

3. Breaking of Supersymmetry by Fractional Brane in Three-brane Solution Background

The supersymmetry breaking produced by fractional $D3$ -branes can be detected by checking the supersymmetry transformations of fermionic fields Λ and Ψ_M of type IIB supergravity in the space-time background described by K-S solution (212) and observing the existence of Killing spinors. The field content of type IIB supergravity consists of the dilaton field ϕ , the metric G_{MN} and the second-rank antisymmetric tensor field $B_{(2)MN}$ from NS-NS sector and axion field $C_{(0)}$, the two-form potential $C_{(2)MN}$ and four-form potential $C_{(4)MNPQ}$ with self-dual field strength from R-R sector. The fermionic fields are left-handed complex Weyl gravitino Ψ_M and right-handed complex Weyl dilatino Λ , $\Gamma^{11}\Psi_M = -\Psi_M$, $\Gamma^{11}\Lambda = \Lambda$. The supersymmetry transformation laws for the fermionic fields of type IIB supergravity read [106],

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\Lambda &= \frac{i}{\kappa_{10}}\Gamma^M\epsilon^*P_M - \frac{i}{24}\Gamma^{MNP}\epsilon G_{(3)MNP} + \text{fermions relevant terms}, \\ \delta\Psi_M &= \frac{1}{\kappa_{10}}\left(D_M - \frac{1}{2}iQ_M\right)\epsilon + \frac{i}{480}\Gamma^{PQRST}\Gamma_M\epsilon\hat{F}_{(5)PQRST} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{96}\left(\Gamma_M{}^{NPQ}G_{(3)NPQ} - 9\Gamma^{NP}G_{(3)MNP}\right)\epsilon^* + \text{fermions relevant terms}, \\ M, N, \dots &= 0, 1, \dots, 9.\end{aligned}\tag{224}$$

In above equations, the supersymmetry transformation parameter ϵ is a left-handed complex Weyl spinor, $\Gamma^{11}\epsilon = -\epsilon$, and other quantities are listed as the following,

$$\begin{aligned}P_M &= f^2\partial_MB, \quad Q_M = f^2\text{Im}(B\partial_MB^*), \quad B \equiv \frac{1+i\tau}{1-i\tau}, \\ f^{-2} &= 1 - BB^*, \quad \tau = C_{(0)} + ie^{-\phi}, \\ G_{(3)MNP} &= f\left(\hat{F}_{(3)MNP} - B\hat{F}_{(3)MNP}^*\right), \\ \hat{F}_{(3)MNP} &= 3\partial_{[M}A_{(2)NP]}, \quad A_{(2)MN} \equiv C_{(2)MN} + iB_{(2)MN}, \\ \hat{F}_{(5)MNPQR} &= F_{(5)MNPQR} - \frac{\kappa_{10}}{8} \times 10 \text{Im}\left(A_{[(2)MN}\hat{F}_{(3)PQR]}\right), \\ F_{(5)MNPQR} &= 5\partial_{[M}C_{(4)NPQR]}, \\ D_M\epsilon &= \partial_M\epsilon + \frac{1}{4}\omega_M{}^{AB}\Gamma_{AB}\epsilon.\end{aligned}\tag{225}$$

To highlight the effects of fractional branes, we first consider the supersymmetry transformation in the background without fractional branes and work on the background furnished by three-brane solution whose near-horizon limit is $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ (211). The supersymmetry transformations for the fermionic fields in such a background read:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\Lambda &= 0, \\ \delta\Psi_M &= \frac{1}{\kappa_{10}}\left(\partial_M + \frac{1}{4}\omega_M{}^{AB}\Gamma_{AB}\right)\epsilon + \frac{i}{480}\Gamma^{PQRST}F_{(5)PQRST}\Gamma_M\epsilon = 0.\end{aligned}\tag{226}$$

The first equation $\delta\Lambda = 0$ is trivially satisfied. We only need to substitute the background solution (211) into $\delta\Psi_M = 0$ and then solve it to observe whether there exist non-trivial Killing spinors.

First, the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ metric (211) can be rewritten in terms of the vielbein,

$$\begin{aligned}
ds_{10}^2 &= (e^a)^2 + (e^{\bar{r}})^2 + \sum_{\tilde{i}=1}^2 (V^{\tilde{i}})^2 + \sum_{\hat{i}=1}^2 (V^{\hat{i}})^2 + (V^{\hat{3}})^2, \\
e^a &= \frac{r}{L} \delta^a_{\mu} dx^{\mu}, \quad e^{\bar{r}} = \frac{L}{r} \delta^{\bar{r}}_r dr, \\
V^{\tilde{1}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} L \sigma^{\tilde{1}}, \quad V^{\tilde{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} L \sigma^{\tilde{2}}, \\
V^{\hat{1}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} L \sigma^{\hat{1}}, \quad V^{\hat{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} L \sigma^{\hat{2}}, \quad V^{\hat{3}} = \frac{1}{3} L (\sigma^{\tilde{3}} + \sigma^{\hat{3}})
\end{aligned} \tag{227}$$

Using the structure equation and torsion-free condition, $T^A = dE^A + \omega^A_B \wedge E^B = 0$, and taking into account following identities on $T^{1,1}$,

$$d\sigma^{\tilde{i}} = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ijk} \sigma^{\tilde{j}} \wedge \sigma^{\tilde{k}}, \quad d\sigma^{\hat{i}} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ijk} \sigma^{\hat{j}} \wedge \sigma^{\hat{k}}, \tag{228}$$

we derive spin connections such as $\omega^a_{\bar{r}} = -\omega^{\bar{r}}_a = e^a/L$ etc.. Then the Killing spinor equation (226) with the self-dual five-form field given in (211) leads to [105],

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon &= r^{\Gamma_{\star}/2} \left[1 + \frac{\Gamma_r}{2R^2} x^{\mu} \Gamma_{\mu} (1 - \Gamma_{\star}) \right] \epsilon_0, \\
\Gamma_{\star} &\equiv i \Gamma_{x_0} \Gamma_{x_1} \Gamma_{x_2} \Gamma_{x_3}, \quad \Gamma_{\star}^2 = 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{229}$$

where ϵ_0 is an arbitrary constant spinor in ten dimensions but constrained by

$$\Gamma_{g_1 g_2} \epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0, \quad \Gamma_{g_3 g_4} \epsilon_0 = -\epsilon_0. \tag{230}$$

In above equations, for clarity we use the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ space-time coordinates to label the components of Γ -matrices. The Killing spinor solution (229) is consistent with the chirality $\Gamma_{11} \epsilon = -\epsilon$. The constraint (230) on ϵ_0 leads to

$$\Gamma_{g_1 g_2} \epsilon = \epsilon, \quad \Gamma_{g_3 g_4} \epsilon = -\epsilon \tag{231}$$

because $\Gamma_{g_1 g_2}$ and $\Gamma_{g_3 g_4}$ commute with $\Gamma_{\star}$ and Γ_{μ} , $\mu = x_0, \dots, x_3$. Eq.(231) means that the Killing spinor ϵ has only eight independent components. This implies that after the spontaneous compactification on $T^{1,1}$, type IIB supergravity in $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background gives rise to $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity coupled with $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ Yang-Mills fields and some Betti tensor multiplets due to non-trivial topology of $T^{1,1}$.

Furthermore, the Killing spinor (229) is actually a formally unified expression for the following two types of Killing spinors [105,107],

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_+ &= r^{1/2} \epsilon_{0+}, \quad \epsilon_- = r^{-1/2} \epsilon_{0-} + \frac{r^{1/2}}{L^2} \Gamma_r x^{\mu} \Gamma_{\mu} \epsilon_{0-}, \\
\epsilon_{0\pm} &= \frac{1}{2} (1 \pm \Gamma_{\star}) \epsilon_0, \quad \Gamma_{\star} \epsilon_{0\pm} = \pm \epsilon_{0\pm}.
\end{aligned} \tag{232}$$

The above equations show that ϵ_+ is independent of the coordinates on $D3$ -brane world-volume and is a right-handed eigenspinor of $\Gamma_{\star}$, i.e., $\Gamma_{\star} \epsilon_+ = \epsilon_+$. It thus represents the $\mathcal{N} = 1$

Poincaré supersymmetry in a four-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theory. On the other hand, ϵ_- depends on x^μ linearly and is not an eigenspinor of $\Gamma_\star$. So it indicates the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ conformal supersymmetry of supersymmetric gauge theory in four dimensions.

When we switch on M fractional branes, the background is described by the K-S solution (212). The above Killing spinor equations from the supersymmetric transformations on dilatino and gravitino becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\Lambda &= -\frac{i}{24}\hat{F}_{(3)MNP}\Gamma^{MNP}\epsilon = 0, \\ \delta\Psi_M &= \frac{1}{\kappa}\left(\partial_M + \frac{1}{4}\omega_M^{AB}\Gamma^{AB}\right)\eta + \frac{i}{480}\Gamma^{PQRST}\Gamma_M\epsilon\hat{F}_{(5)PQRST} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{96}\left(\Gamma_M^{NPQ}\hat{F}_{(3)NPQ} - 9\Gamma^{NP}\hat{F}_{(3)MNP}\right)\epsilon^\star = 0.\end{aligned}\tag{233}$$

The metric (212) expressed in terms of $\sigma^{\tilde{i}}$ and $\sigma^{\hat{i}}$ takes the following form [105],

$$\begin{aligned}ds_{10}^2 &= h^{-1/2}(\tau)\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + h^{1/2}(\tau)\frac{1}{2}\mu^{4/3}K(\tau)\left\{\frac{1}{3[K(\tau)]^3}\left[d\tau^2 + (\sigma^{\tilde{3}} + \sigma^{\hat{3}})^2\right]\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \frac{\sinh^2\tau}{2\cosh\tau}\left[(\sigma^{\tilde{1}})^2 + (\sigma^{\tilde{2}})^2\right] + \frac{\cosh\tau}{2}\left[\left(\sigma^{\hat{1}} + \frac{\sigma^1}{\cosh\tau}\right)^2 + \left(\sigma^{\hat{2}} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\cosh\tau}\right)^2\right]\right\},\end{aligned}\tag{234}$$

where the vielbein one-forms read [105]

$$\begin{aligned}e^a &= h^{-1/4}(\tau)\delta^a_\mu dx^\mu, \quad e^{\tilde{\tau}} = \frac{\mu^{2/3}h^{1/4}(\tau)}{\sqrt{6}K(\tau)}d\tau\delta^{\tilde{\tau}}_\tau d\tau, \\ V^{\tilde{i}} &= \frac{\mu^{2/3}h^{1/4}(\tau)K^{1/2}(\tau)}{2}\frac{\sinh\tau}{\sqrt{\cosh\tau}}\sigma^{\tilde{i}}, \quad \tilde{i} = 1, 2 \\ V^{\hat{i}} &= \frac{\mu^{2/3}h^{1/4}(\tau)K^{1/2}(\tau)}{2}\sqrt{\cosh\tau}\left(\sigma^{\hat{i}} + \frac{\sigma^i}{\cosh\tau}\right), \quad \hat{i} = 1, 2 \\ V^{\hat{3}} &= \frac{\mu^{2/3}h^{1/4}(\tau)}{\sqrt{6}K(\tau)}(\sigma^{\tilde{3}} + \sigma^{\hat{3}}).\end{aligned}\tag{235}$$

The same procedure as the case without fractional brane gives the following Killing spinor [105]

$$\epsilon = h^{-1/8}(\tau)\exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\Gamma_{g_1g_2}\right)\epsilon_0,\tag{236}$$

where α is defined by

$$\sin\alpha \equiv -\frac{1}{\cosh\tau}, \quad \cos\alpha \equiv \frac{\sinh\tau}{\cosh\tau}.\tag{237}$$

ϵ_0 is a constant spinor but suffers from following constraints [105],

$$\Gamma_\star\epsilon_0 = -i\epsilon_0, \quad \Gamma_{g_1g_2}\epsilon_0 = -\Gamma_{g_3g_4}\epsilon_0, \quad \Gamma_{rg_5}\epsilon_0 = -i\epsilon_0.\tag{238}$$

These constraints on ϵ_0 determine that the Killing spinor ϵ should satisfy

$$\Gamma_{\star}\epsilon = -i\epsilon, \quad \Gamma_{g_1g_2}\epsilon = -\Gamma_{g_3g_4}\epsilon = i(\cos\alpha + \sin\alpha\Gamma_{g_1g_3})\epsilon, \quad \Gamma_{rg_5}\epsilon = -i\epsilon. \quad (239)$$

These three constraints imply that ϵ has only four independent components. Specifically, now ϵ is independent of the coordinate on the world-volume of $D3$ -brane. This four-component Killing spinor means the only existence of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Poincaré supersymmetry. This indicates that the conformal supersymmetry in the dual four-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theory disappear due to the presence of fractional $D3$ -branes.

VI. GRAVITY DUAL OF SUPERCONFORMAL ANOMALY AS SPONTANEOUSLY BREAKING OF LOCAL SUPERSYMMETRY BREAKING IN GAUGED AdS_5 SUPERGRAVITY AND CONSEQUENT SUPER-HIGGS EFFECT

A. Spontaneous Compactification of Type IIB Supergravity and Symmetry Breaking in Gauged AdS_5 Supergravity

The above analysis shows that the geometrical background represented by K-S solution keeps less space-time symmetries in type IIB supergravity than $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ does. We choose this solution as a classical vacuum configuration for type IIB supergravity and expand the theory around such a background. The spontaneous of local symmetries in gauged AdS_5 supergravity will occur and the consequent super-Higgs mechanism will take place.

To expound this physical phenomenon clearly, we first consider the case without $D3$ -fractional branes and the vacuum configuration for type IIB supergravity is $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ given in (211). However, a gravitational system has geometrical meaning, expanding ten-dimensional type IIB supergravity around such a vacuum configuration is actually a process of performing spontaneous compactification of type IIB supergravity [15,18,108] on the compact internal manifold $T^{1,1}$. According to the general idea of the Kaluza-Klein (K-K) compactification [109], all the geometrical symmetries reflected in the internal manifold including the supersymmetry it preserves should emerge as local symmetries in the compactified theory. For example, the isometric symmetry of internal manifold becomes the gauge symmetry of compactified theory. Therefore, for type IIB supergravity in the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background, the isometry symmetry of $T^{1,1}$ is $SU(2) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ and it preserves eight supersymmetries, the resultant theory after compactification should be $\mathcal{N} = 2$ five-dimensional $U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity coupled with $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ Yang-Mills vector multiplets and several Betti tensor supermultiplets, whose presence attributes to the nontrivial topology of $T^{1,1}$ [110]. The local symmetries in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity are the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry, $SO(2,4)$ space-time symmetry and $U(1)$ gauge symmetry.

When fractional branes switch on, the fluxes carried by them deform $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ space-time, and the space-time geometry is described by the K-S solution. In practical calculation we use the UV limit of K-S solution — the K-T solution (216) [104]). The discussions in last section show that the amount of the isometry symmetry of the deformed $T^{1,1}$ and supersymmetries it preserves are less than that exploited from $T^{1,1}$. Therefore, the compactified theory obtained from the compactification of type IIB supergravity on the deformed $T^{1,1}$,

i.e., the five-dimensional gauged supergravity, should possess less local symmetries than those extracted from $T^{1,1}$. This means that some of local symmetries break spontaneously since the breaking takes place on the classical solution to type IIB supergravity.

A straightforward consequence of the spontaneous breaking of local symmetry is the occurrence of Higgs mechanism. Just like what usually done in gauge theory, we reparametrize the field variable and “shift” the vacuum configuration described by the K-T solution back to $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$. The essence of this operation is performing local symmetry transformation and transferring the non-symmetric feature of the vacuum configuration to the classical action. Then we expand type IIB supergravity around $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ with newly defined field variables, the action of five-dimensional gauged supergravity should lose some of local symmetries and the graviton multiplet in gauged AdS_5 supergravity should obtain mass by eating a Goldstone multiplet relevant to NS-NS- and R-R two-form fields in the K-S solution. In this way, we reveal how the super-Higgs mechanism due to the spontaneous breaking of local supersymmetry in gauged supergravity occurs. In fact, this phenomenon is well known in the Kaluza-Klein supergravity [111]: when the internal manifold is deformed or squashed, it keeps less symmetries for the compactified theory than the undeformed (or unsquashed) internal manifold. This is the so-called “space invader” scenario and can be naturally given an interpretation in terms of spontaneous breaking of local symmetry in K-K supergravity [111].

Now we have realized following physical phenomena. On the field theory side the presence fractional $D3$ -branes is the origin for superconformal anomaly, while on gravity side, they deform the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ space-time geometry of type IIB supergravity and hence lead to the spontaneous breaking of local symmetries and the consequent super-Higgs mechanism in gauged AdS_5 supergravity. These two physical phenomena have common origin in brane configuration and thus should be dual to each other in the gauge/gravity correspondence.

Before proceeding to establish the dual correspondence between the superconformal anomaly in a supersymmetric gauge theory and the super-Higgs mechanism in gauged AdS_5 supergravity, we review the compactification of type IIB supergravity on $T^{1,1}$.

The first step of performing the compactification on $T^{1,1}$ is writing the metric in (208) as the Kaluza-Klein metric form,

$$ds^2 = h^{-1/2}(r)\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + h^{1/2}(r)dr^2 + h^{1/2}(r)r^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{9}(g^5 - 2A)^2 + \frac{1}{6} \left[\sum_{r=1}^2 (g^r - K^{ar}\widehat{W}^a)^2 + \sum_{s=3}^4 \left(g^s - L^{bs}\widehat{W}^b \right)^2 \right] \right\}. \quad (240)$$

In above equation, K^{ar} and L^{bs} are components of Killing vectors K^a and L^b on $T^{1,1}$, they are generators for $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ Yang-Mills gauge group in the resultant $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged supergravity coupled with six Yang-Mills vector supermultiplets,

$$[K^{a_1}, K^{a_2}] = if^{a_1 a_2 a_3} K^{a_3}, \quad [L^{b_1}, L^{b_2}] = if^{b_1 b_2 b_3} L^{b_3}; \quad (241)$$

$\widehat{W}^a = \widehat{W}_\alpha^a dx^\alpha$ and $\widehat{\widehat{W}}^b = \widehat{\widehat{W}}_\alpha^b dx^\alpha$ are the corresponding six $SU(2)$ gauge fields in five-dimensional space-time; $\widehat{A} = \widehat{A}_\alpha dx^\alpha$ is the $U(1)$ gauge field corresponding to the isometry symmetry $U(1)$ and it constitutes a $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supermultiplets with the graviton $\widehat{h}_{\alpha\beta}$ and gravitini $\widehat{\psi}_\alpha^i$ ($i = 1, 2$) in five-dimensional gauged supergravity. The isometry symmetry

and various other geometric symmetries manifested in the internal manifold such as the supersymmetry it preserves all convert into local symmetries of the compactified theory. To serve our purpose we concentrate only on the $U(1)$ symmetry since it is the gauge symmetry that enters space-time supersymmetry in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity.

Accompanying with the K-K metric (240) the self-dual five-form in Eq. (208) should also be modified to keep its self-duality since the Hodge star operation is defined with respect to the metric [1],

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{F}_5 = d\overline{C}_4 &= \frac{1}{g_s} \partial_r h^{-1}(r) dx^0 \wedge dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 \wedge dr \\ &+ \frac{L^4}{27} \left[\chi \wedge g^1 \wedge g^2 \wedge g^3 \wedge g^4 - dA \wedge g^5 \wedge dg^5 + \frac{3}{L} (\star_5 dA) \wedge dg^5 \right].\end{aligned}\quad (242)$$

Consequently, there exists locally

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{C}_4 &= \frac{1}{g_s} h^{-1}(r) dx^0 \wedge dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 \\ &+ \frac{2L^4}{27} \left[\beta g^1 \wedge g^2 \wedge g^3 \wedge g^4 - \frac{1}{2} A \wedge g^5 \wedge dg^5 + \frac{3}{2r} h^{-1/4}(r) (\star_5 dA) \wedge dg^5 \right],\end{aligned}\quad (243)$$

where $\chi = g^5 - 2A$, $\star_5$ is the five-dimensional Hodge dual defined with respect to AdS_5 metric

$$ds_{AdS_5}^2 = \hat{g}_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)}(x, r) dx^\alpha dx^\beta = \frac{r^2}{L^2} \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + \frac{L^2}{r^2} dr^2. \quad (244)$$

Obviously, the K-K metric (240) and $\overline{F}_5$ are gauge invariant under local $U(1)$ gauge transformation in the gauged AdS_5 supergravity,

$$\beta \rightarrow \beta + \Lambda, \quad A \rightarrow A + d\Lambda. \quad (245)$$

$\overline{F}_5$ satisfies the Bianchi identity $d\overline{F}_5 = 0$, which determines A is a massless vector fields in AdS_5 space, i.e., $d\star_5 dA = 0$.

Let us turn to the specifics of performing compactification on $T^{1,1}$ [112]. Usually when performing compactification of a certain D -dimensional supergravity on $AdS_{D-d} \times K^d$, one should first linearize the classical equation of motion for field function $\Phi(x, y) \equiv \Phi^{\{J\}[\lambda]}(x, y)$ in $AdS_{D-d} \times K^d$ background. In the above, $K^d = G/H$ is certain d -dimensional compact Einstein manifold, x and y are the coordinates on AdS_{D-d} and K^d , respectively; $\{J\}$ and $[\lambda]$ label the representations of local Lorentz groups $SO(2, D-d-1)$ and $SO(d)$ realized on field functions, respectively. The next step is to expand the y -dependent part of field functions in terms of H -harmonics on K^d , which are representations of the group G branched (or reduced) with respect to its subgroup H . If the internal manifold is $K^d = S^d = SO(d+1)/SO(d)$, which is the maximally symmetric Einstein manifold, this procedure works smoothly since now H is $SO(d)$ and it coincides with local Lorentz group of the d -dimensional internal manifold. However, if the internal manifold is a less symmetric one, then H is usually a subgroup of $SO(d)$. In this case, the field function representations of $SO(d)$ are usually reducible under the action of H . Therefore, only those H -harmonics that are identical to the $SO(d)$ field function representations branched by H can contribute to the expansion of field functions on K^d .

The compactification of type IIB supergravity on $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ is exactly like this. $T^{1,1}$ is the coset space $G/H = [SU(2) \times SU(2)]/U_H(1)$ and the generator of $U_H(1)$ is the sum $T^3 + \hat{T}^3$ of two diagonal generators of $SU(2) \times SU(2)$. The harmonics on $T^{1,1}$ are representations of $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ labeled by weights $\{\nu\} = (j, l)$,

$$Y(y) \equiv \left([Y^{(j,l,r)}(y)]^m \right). \quad (246)$$

In above equation, $m = 1, \dots, (2j+1) \times (2l+1)$ are the representation space indices of $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ and r is the representation quantum number for the $U(1)$ group whose generator is $T_3 - \hat{T}_3$. This $U(1)$ group is actually the R -symmetry group in the dual $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric gauge theory, which on the gravity side originates from the isometry group $SU(2) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ of $T^{1,1}$. The representations (j, l) are reducible with respect to the subgroup $U_H(1)$ and hence decompose into a direct sum of fragments labeled by the $U_H(1)$ -charge q_i ,

$$[Y^{(j,l,r)}(y)]^m = \bigoplus_i [Y^{(j,l,r)}(y)]_{q_i}^m = \begin{pmatrix} [Y^{(j,l,r)}(y)]_{q_1}^m \\ [Y^{(j,l,r)}(y)]_{q_2}^m \\ \vdots \\ [Y^{(j,l,r)}(y)]_{q_N}^m \end{pmatrix}. \quad (247)$$

The irreducible representations $[Y^{(j,l,r)}(y)]_{q_i}^m$ are called $U_H(1)$ -harmonics on $T^{1,1}$.

On the other hand, since the field function $\Phi^{\{J\}[\lambda]}(x, y)$ on $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ lies in certain representations of the local Lorentz group $SO(2, 4) \times SO(5)$, here $\{J\}$, $[\lambda]$ denoting the representation wights for $SO(2, 4)$ and $SO(5)$, respectively. The $U_H(1)$ is a subgroup of $SO(5)$ since the representation of its generator can be naturally embedded into the representation of $SO(5)$ generators [113]. The representations $[\lambda]$ of $SO(5)$ furnished by the y -dependent part of $\Phi^{\{J\}[\lambda]}(x, y)$, which are denoted as $[X^{[\lambda]}(y)]^n$, are also reducible with respect to $U_H(1)$, n being the representation indices of $SO(5)$ in field function space. The field function representation space thus decomposes into a direct sum of irreducible subspaces labeled by the $U_H(1)$ -charge q_ξ ,

$$[X^{[\lambda]}(y)]^n = \bigoplus_{\xi=1}^K [X^{[\lambda]}(y)]_{q_\xi}^n = \begin{pmatrix} [X^{[\lambda]}(y)]_{q_1}^n \\ [X^{[\lambda]}(y)]_{q_2}^n \\ \vdots \\ [X^{[\lambda]}(y)]_{q_K}^n \end{pmatrix}. \quad (248)$$

The irreducible representations $[X^{[\lambda]}(y)]_{q_\xi}^n$ in above equation are usually called the $SO(5)$ harmonics. The field function naturally admits an expansion in terms of the $SO(5)$ harmonics. Therefore, a U_H -harmonics Y can contribute to the expansion of a field function on $T^{1,1}$ only when it is identical to (or contains) certain $SO(5)$ harmonics X . A detailed analysis on how the $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ representations branched with respect to $U_H(1)$ appear in the decomposition of the field function representations of $SO(5)$ with respect to $U_H(1)$ is

performed in Ref. [112]. Once the expansion of field function $\Phi^{\{J\}[\lambda]}(x, y)$ in terms of those admissible $U_H(1)$ -harmonics on $T^{1,1}$ is known [112],

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^{\{J\}[\lambda]}(x, y) &= \left(\Phi_{ab\dots}^{\{J\}}(x, y) \right)^{[\lambda]} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^N \left(\Phi_{q_i}^{\{J\}} \right)^{[\lambda]} = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{q_1}^{\{J\}}(x, y) \\ \Phi_{q_2}^{\{J\}}(x, y) \\ \vdots \\ \Phi_{q_N}^{\{J\}}(x, y) \end{pmatrix}, \\ \Phi_{q_i}^{\{J\}}(x, y) &= \sum_{(j,l)} \sum_m \sum_r \Phi_{q_i m}^{\{J\}(j,l,r)}(x) \left[Y^{(j,l,r)}(y) \right]_{q_i}^m, \end{aligned} \quad (249)$$

then we substitute it into the following linearized equations of motion of type IIB supergravity in $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background,

$$\left(K_x^{\{J\}} + K_y^{[\lambda]} \right) \Phi^{\{J\}[\lambda]}(x, y) = 0. \quad (250)$$

In above equations, $a, b \dots$ are the indices of the $[\lambda]$ -representation, $K_x^{\{J\}}$ and $K_y^{[\lambda]}$ are the kinetic operators of type IIB supergravity on AdS_5 and $T^{1,1}$, respectively. Usually there are three types kinetic operators $K_y^{[\lambda]}$ in supergravity: the Hodge-de Rahm- and Laplacian operators acting on the scalar, vector and antisymmetric fields; the Dirac and Rarita-Schwinger operator acting on the fermionic fields and the Lichnerowicz operator on the symmetric rank-two tensor field. All these three types of operators are (or are relevant to) certain Laplace-Beltrami operators on $T^{1,1} = [SU(2) \times SU(2)]/U_H(1)$. Thus the action of $K_y^{[\lambda]}$ on $U_H(1)$ -harmonics gives [112]

$$K_y^{[\lambda]} \left[Y^{(j,l,r)}(y) \right]_{q_i}^m = M_{ik}^{(j,l,r)} \left[Y^{(j,l,r)}(y) \right]_{q_k}^m. \quad (251)$$

This equation together with the linearized equation of motion (250) and $U_H(1)$ -harmonic expansion (249) of field functions shows that $M_{ij}^{(j,l,r)}$ are mass matrices for the K-K particle tower $\Phi_{q_k m}^{\{J\}(j,l,r)}(x)$ in AdS_5 space,

$$\left(\delta_{ik} K_x^{\{J\}} + M_{ik}^{(j,l,r)} \right) \Phi_{q_k m}^{\{J\}(j,l,r)}(x) = 0. \quad (252)$$

Therefore, the zero modes of the kinetic operator $K_y^{[\lambda]}$ will constitute field content of the compactified theory, which turned out to be the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity coupled with $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ Yang-Mills vector supermultiplets as well as some Betti tensor multiplets [112].

B. $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ Gauged AdS_5 Supergravity from Type IIB supergravity in $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ Space-time Background

In this subsection, we show how the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity comes from type IIB supergravity in the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ vacuum configuration.

The action of type IIB supergravity is listed as the following [14,106],

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\text{IIB}} &= S_{\text{NS-NS}} + S_{\text{R-R}} + S_{\text{CS}} + S_{\text{F}}, \\
S_{\text{NS-NS}} &= \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x E e^{-2\Phi} \left(R + 4\partial_M \Phi \partial^M \Phi - \frac{1}{2 \times 3!} H_{(3)MNP} H_{(3)}^{MNP} \right), \\
S_{\text{R-R}} &= -\frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x E \left(\frac{1}{2} \partial_M C_{(0)} \partial^M C_{(0)} + \frac{1}{2 \times 3!} \tilde{F}_{(3)MNP} \tilde{F}_{(3)}^{MNP} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{4 \times 5!} \hat{F}_{(5)MNPQR} \hat{F}_{(5)}^{MNPQR} \right), \\
S_{\text{CS}} &= -\frac{1}{4\kappa_{10}^2} \int C_{(4)} \wedge F_{(3)} \wedge H_{(3)} \\
&= -\frac{1}{4\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \frac{1}{4! \times 3! \times 3!} \epsilon^{M_1 \dots M_4 N_1 \dots N_3 P_1 \dots P_3} C_{(4)M_1 \dots M_4} F_{(3)N_1 \dots N_3} H_{(3)P_1 \dots P_3}, \\
S_{\text{F}} &= \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x E \left[-\frac{i}{2} \bar{\Lambda} \Gamma^M D_M \Lambda + \frac{1}{4 \times 5!} \bar{\Lambda} \Gamma^{MNPQR} \Lambda \hat{F}_{(5)MNPQR} \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{i}{2} \bar{\Psi}_M \Gamma^{MNP} D_N \Psi_P - \frac{1}{8 \times 5!} \bar{\Psi}_M \Gamma^{MNP} \left(\Gamma^{UVWXY} \hat{F}_{(5)UVWXY} \right) \Gamma_N \Psi_P \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{i}{48} \kappa_{10} \bar{\Psi}_M \Gamma^{NPQ} \left(F_{(3)NPQ} - i H_{(3)NPQ} \right) \Gamma^M \Lambda + \text{four-fermion terms} \right], \quad (253)
\end{aligned}$$

which is further supplemented with the self-dual constraint on the five-form field strength $\star \tilde{F}_5 = \tilde{F}_5$. In above equation

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{F}_{(3)MNP} &\equiv F_{(3)MNP} - C_{(0)} H_{(3)MNP}, \\
\hat{F}_{(5)MNPQR} &\equiv F_{(5)MNPQR} - \frac{5}{4} \kappa_{10} C_{[(2)MN} H_{(3)PQR]} + \frac{5}{4} \kappa_{10} B_{[(2)MN} F_{(3)PQR]}. \quad (254)
\end{aligned}$$

The arising of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged supergravity from type IIB supergravity in the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background can be observed from the classification of the particle spectrum under the AdS_5 space-time supergroup $SU(2, 2|1)$. The bosonic subgroup of $SU(2, 2|1)$ is $SO(2, 4) \times U(1)$, of which $SO(2, 4)$ is actually the isometry group of AdS_5 space-time. Further, $SO(2, 4)$ has the subgroup $SO(2) \times SO(4) = SO(2) \times SU(2) \times SU(2)$ and the $U(1)$ comes from the isometry group $SU(2) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ of $T^{1,1}$. This $U(1)$ is the gauge group of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity, while on the dual field theory side it is the R -symmetry group for the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric gauge theory in four dimensions. A representation $D(E_0, j, l|r)$ of $SU(2, 2|1)$ is labeled by the AdS_5 energy E_0 , the $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ quantum number (j, l) and $U(1)$ -charge r . According to the representation of $SU(2, 2|1)$, the K-K spectrum of type IIB supergravity on $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ can be classified into a graviton multiplet, four gravitino multiplets and four vector multiplets and also some Betti multiplets. The massless gravitino supermultiplet $(\hat{h}_{\alpha\beta}, \hat{\psi}_\alpha^i, \hat{A}_\alpha)$ constitutes the following representations of $SU(2, 2|1)$,

$$D(4, 1, 1|0) \oplus D(7/2, 1, 1/2|-1) \oplus D(7/2, 1/2, 1|1) \oplus D(3, 1/2, 1/2|0). \quad (255)$$

These are the so-called maximal shortening representations to $SU(2, 2|1)$ since the bound for a unitary irreducible representation is saturated by this supermultiplet. That is, they satisfy $E_0 = 2 + j + l$, $r = 2(j - l)/3$.

Further, the above graviton multiplet indeed arises from the compactification of type IIB supergravity on $T^{1,1}$. First, $\hat{h}_{\alpha\beta}(x)$ is the massless mode in the scalar $U_{\text{H}}(1)$ -harmonic

expansion of $H_{\alpha\beta}(x, y)$, which is the AdS_5 space-time component of ten-dimensional graviton $H_{MN}(x, y)$; $\hat{A}_\alpha$ is the linear combination of two massless modes in the vector $U_H(1)$ -harmonic expansion of $H_{\alpha a}$ and $C_{(4)\alpha abc}$, which are the crossing components on AdS_5 and $T^{1,1}$ of the graviton $H_{MN}(x, y)$ and the R-R four form field $C_{(4)MNPQ}(x, y)$, respectively; $\hat{\psi}_\alpha$ comes from the massless mode in the spinor $U_H(1)$ -harmonics expansion of ψ_α , which is the AdS_5 component of ten-dimensional gravitino ψ_M [112]. Based on above compactification, the action of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity can be straightforwardly extracted out from type IIB supergravity in the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background,

$$S_{\text{gauged}} = \frac{1}{\kappa_5^2} \int d^5 x \hat{e} \left[-\frac{1}{2} \hat{R} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\bar{\psi}}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} \hat{D}_\beta \hat{\psi}_{i\gamma} - \frac{3l^2}{32} \hat{F}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{F}_{\alpha\beta} + \dots \right]. \quad (256)$$

In above equation we list only the quadratic sector of the action for graviton supermultiplet and omit the terms involving other Yang-Mills vector multiplets and Betti multiplets. Eq. (256) shows that the graviton multiplet $(\hat{A}_\alpha, \hat{\psi}_\alpha^i, \hat{h}_{\alpha\beta})$ is massless. This graviton multiplet should be dual to the current supermultiplet $(j_\mu, s_\mu, T_{\mu\nu})$ of the supersymmetric gauge field theory on the AdS_5 boundary in terms of the holographic definition on AdS/CFT correspondence [4].

This scenario will change in terms of the gauge/gravity correspondence due to the superconformal anomaly of the supersymmetric gauge theory.

C. Dual of Chiral R -symmetry Anomaly $\partial_\mu j^\mu$

We first review the dual description of the chiral $U_R(1)$ anomaly of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ gauge theory from type IIB supergravity in the K-S solution background found in Ref. [1].

When fractional branes are absent, the K-K metric and the five-form field shown in Eqs. (240) and (242) are $U_R(1)$ gauge invariant after the compactification on $T^{1,1}$ is performed. The graviton multiplet of gauged AdS_5 supergravity is massless. When fractional branes switch on, both the K-K metric (240) and the five-form (242) get deformed, but they still keep $U_R(1)$ gauge invariant. However, as shown in Eq. (212), the field strength $F_{(3)}$ of R-R two-form $C_{(2)}$ appears in the background solution and it depends on the angle β linearly,

$$F_{(3)} = \frac{M\alpha'}{2} \omega_3 = \frac{M\alpha'}{2} g^5 \wedge \omega_2 = \frac{M\alpha'}{4} g^5 \wedge (g^1 \wedge g^2 + g^3 \wedge g^4), \\ g^5 = 2d\beta + \cos\theta_1 d\phi_1 + \cos\theta_2 d\phi_2, \quad (257)$$

it is not invariant under the rotation of β -angle. Like what usually done in dealing with the spontaneous breaking of gauge symmetry, one should consider the fluctuations around this $F_{(3)}$ and shift it as

$$\bar{F}_{(3)} = \frac{M\alpha'}{2} (g^5 + 2\partial_\alpha \theta dx^\alpha) \wedge \omega_2. \quad (258)$$

by introducing a new field,

$$\theta \equiv F \int_{S^2} C_2. \quad (259)$$

In above equation F is a field function in ten-dimensional space-time. $F_{(3)}$ is obviously invariant under the combined gauge transformation,

$$\beta \rightarrow \beta + \alpha, \quad \theta \rightarrow \theta - \alpha. \quad (260)$$

Further, $\overline{F}_{(3)}$ can be rewritten in terms of the gauge invariant quantity $\chi \equiv g^5 - 2A$ and a newly defined vector field W_α ,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{F}_3 &= \frac{M\alpha'}{2} (\chi + 2W_\alpha dx^\alpha) \wedge \omega_2 \\ &\equiv \overline{F}_3^{(0)} + M\alpha' W_\alpha dx^\alpha \wedge \omega_2; \\ W_\alpha &\equiv A_\alpha + \partial_\alpha \theta, \quad \overline{F}_3^{(0)} = \frac{M\alpha'}{2} \chi. \end{aligned} \quad (261)$$

The vector field W_α and the $U(1)$ gauge field A_α have the same field strength $F_{\alpha\beta}$, but W_α has got the longitudinal component. Now we consider type IIB supergravity in the symmetric vacuum configuration furnished by the metric (240), the self-dual five-form (242) and this new R-R three-form field strength $\overline{F}_3^{(0)}$ defined in (261). Taking into account only the Einstein-Hilbert- and the R-R three-form terms in the classical action (253) of type IIB supergravity, one has [1]

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{IIB}} &= \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \left[ER - \frac{1}{2} F_3 \wedge {}^\star F_3 + \dots \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x E \left[-\frac{1}{9} h^{1/2}(r) r^2 F^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta} - \left(\frac{3M\alpha'}{h^{1/2}(r)r^2} \right)^2 W^\alpha W_\alpha + \dots \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (262)$$

The above equation means that the $U_R(1)$ gauge field coming from the compactification of type IIB supergravity on $T^{1,1}$ has gained a mass, whose value depends on the fluxes carried by fractional branes⁸. This phenomenon exactly means the occurrence of the Higgs mechanism: when fractional branes are present, the classical solution breaks the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry; after we modify the classical solution to make it gauge invariant, the classical action of type IIB supergravity around this symmetric vacuum configuration loses gauge symmetry and the $U(1)$ gauge field acquires a mass.

⁸A rigorous analysis, which takes into account both the self-dual equation for five-form field strength and the $(\alpha\chi)$ -component in the Einstein equation of type IIB supergravity, was performed in Ref. [120]. It showed that there actually exists another vector field K_α , which originates from the fluctuation of the four-form potential $C_{(4)}$ and mixes with W_α . If considering only transverse parts of W_α and K_α , one can diagonalize their coupled equations by taking a linear combination $W_\alpha^{(1)} = W_\alpha - 54/[h(r)r^4]K_\alpha$, $W_\alpha^{(2)} = W_\alpha + 54/[h(r)r^4]K_\alpha$. The decoupled equations show that $W_\alpha^{(2)}$ is actually massive in $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ limit. It is $W_\alpha^{(1)}$ that acquires a mass through the spontaneous breaking of the $U(1)$ -symmetry. In particular, the mass of $W_\alpha^{(1)}$ acquired through Higgs mechanism is at the order of $(M\alpha')^2$ rather than $M\alpha'$.

D. Dual of Scale Anomaly θ^μ_μ

To find the dual of scale anomaly, we first analyze how the local symmetry corresponding to the scale symmetry on field theory side becomes broken in the K-S solution and how it is related to the compactification of type IIB supergravity on the deformed $T^{1,1}$. Obviously, the local symmetry that corresponds to the scale symmetry on field theory side should have nothing to do with the isometry symmetry of internal manifold $T^{1,1}$, and it would rather be related to the diffeomorphism symmetry of the AdS_5 space. The argument for this statement is motivated from Ref. [25], where it was shown that near the AdS_5 boundary the bulk diffeomorphism symmetry preserving the form of AdS_5 metric decomposes into a combination of the four-dimensional diffeomorphism symmetry and Weyl symmetry. According to the AdS/CFT correspondence at supergravity level, the four-dimensional diffeomorphism- and Weyl symmetries are equivalent to the conservation and tracelessness of the energy-momentum tensor of the four-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theory [24]. This suggests that we should observe how the diffeomorphism symmetry of AdS_5 space is spoiled by fractional branes to look for the dual of scale anomaly.

When the fractional branes are absent, the near-horizon limit of this solution is $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$. Let us observe the diffeomorphism symmetry of type IIB supergravity (253) in this background. Since we care about how the breaking of diffeomorphism symmetry affects the graviton, so only the Einstein-Hilbert- and the self-dual five-form terms in the action (253) are taken into account ⁹,

$$S_{\text{IIB}} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x E \left(R - \frac{1}{4 \times 5!} F_{(5)MNPQR} F_{(5)}^{MNPQR} \right) + \dots \quad (263)$$

Using the expansion $G_{MN} = G_{MN}^{(0)} + h_{MN}$, we obtain the quadratic action for the graviton in the background with only non-vanishing $G_{MN}^{(0)}$ and $F_{(5)MNPQR}^{(0)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{Q.G.}} &= \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^{(0)}} \left[-\frac{1}{4} \nabla^P h^{MN} \nabla_P h_{MN} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^P h^{MN} \nabla_M h_{PN} \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \nabla^M h \left(\nabla_M h - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^N h_{MN} \right) \\ &\quad + \left(R^{(0)} - \frac{1}{4 \times 5!} F_{(5)}^{(0)MNPQR} F_{(5)MNPQR}^{(0)} \right) \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{2} h^2 - h^{ST} h_{ST} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4 \times 5!} \left(10 h^{M'[M} h^{N]N'} F_{(5)MNPQR}^{(0)} F_{(5)M'N'}^{(0)PQR} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{5}{2} h^{M'[M} F_{(5)MNPQR}^{(0)} F_{(5)M'}^{(0)NPQR} + 5 h^{M'M''} h_{M''}^{[M} F_{(5)MNPQR}^{(0)} F_{(5)M'}^{(0)NPQR} \right) \left. \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^{(0)}} \left[-\frac{1}{4} \nabla^P h^{MN} \nabla_P h_{MN} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^P h^{MN} \nabla_M h_{PN} \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \nabla^M h \left(\nabla_M h - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^N h_{MN} \right) + \frac{1}{2} R_{MPNQ} h^{MN} h^{PQ} - \frac{1}{2} h^{MN} h_N^P R_{PM} \end{aligned}$$

⁹It is necessary to have this five-form term present since it produces the AdS_5 space-time background.

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{27}{32} \frac{\pi \alpha'^2 N}{h^2(r) r^5} \left(h^{MN} h_{MN} - \frac{1}{2} h^2 \right) \Big] \\
& = \frac{1}{2k_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^{(0)}} \left[-\frac{1}{4} \nabla^P h^{MN} \nabla_P h_{MN} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_M h^{MN} \nabla^P h_{PN} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{4} \nabla^M h \left(\nabla_M h - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^N h_{MN} \right) - \frac{9}{32} \frac{\pi \alpha'^2 N}{h^2(r) r^5} \left(h^{MN} h_{MN} + \frac{1}{2} h^2 \right) \right]. \tag{264}
\end{aligned}$$

We then perform the compactification on $T^{1,1}$ with the quadratic action (264). Taking into account the background dependent and covariant gauge-fixing conditions $D^\xi h_{\xi\alpha} = D^\xi h_{(\xi\varepsilon)} = 0$, one can expand $h_{MN}(x, y)$ in terms of the $U_H(1)$ -harmonics on $T^{1,1}$ [112],

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{MN}(x, y) &= (h_{\alpha\beta}(x, y), h_{\alpha\xi}(x, y), h_{\xi\varepsilon}(x, y)), \\
h_{\alpha\beta}(x, y) &= \sum_{j,l,r} \hat{h}_{\alpha\beta}^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_0^{(j,l,r)}(y), \\
h_{\alpha\xi}(x, y) &= \sum_{j,l,r} \hat{A}_\alpha^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_\xi^{(j,l,r)}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^5 \sum_{j,l,r_i} \hat{A}_\alpha^{(j,l,r_i)}(x) Y_{q_i}^{(j,l,r_i)}(y), \\
h_{(\xi\varepsilon)}(x, y) &\equiv h_{\xi\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{5} g_{\xi\varepsilon} h^\tau{}_\tau = \sum_{j,l,r} \hat{\varphi}^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_{(\xi\varepsilon)}^{(j,l,r)}(y) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{10} \sum_{j,l,r_i} \hat{\varphi}^{(j,l,r_i)}(x) Y_{q_i}^{(j,l,r_i)}(y), \\
h_{\xi}^\xi(x, y) &= \sum_{j,l,r} \hat{\pi}^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_0^{(j,l,r)}(y), \tag{265}
\end{aligned}$$

where D_ξ is the $SO(5)$ covariant derivative defined on $T^{1,1}$.

The eigenvalues of mass matrices of the K-K modes and their classifications under the supersymmetry group $SU(2, 2|1)$ in the AdS_5 space-time are listed in Ref. [112]. The zero modes will constitute the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity coupled with Yang-Mills vector multiplets and some Betti multiplets. Substituting the expansions (265) into (264) and considering only zero modes, we get the quadratic action for the massless graviton of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\text{q.g.}} &= \frac{1}{2k_5^2} \int d^5x \sqrt{-\hat{g}^{(0)}} \left[-\frac{1}{4} \widehat{\nabla}^\gamma \hat{h}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\nabla}_\gamma \hat{h}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\nabla}^\gamma \hat{h}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \hat{h}_{\gamma\beta} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{4} \widehat{\nabla}^\alpha \hat{h} \left(\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \hat{h} - \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\nabla}^\beta \hat{h}_{\alpha\beta} \right) - \frac{1}{l^2} \left(\hat{h}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{h}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{h}^2 \right) + \dots \right]. \tag{266}
\end{aligned}$$

In the following we analyze the symmetry of above graviton action in AdS_5 space-time background. First, the graviton in the AdS_5 background is the fluctuation around space-time metric,

$$ds_5^2 = \hat{g}_{\alpha\beta} dx^\alpha dx^\beta = \left[\hat{g}_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)} + \hat{h}_{\alpha\beta}(x) \right] dx^\alpha dx^\beta. \tag{267}$$

The general coordinate transformation invariance determines the following infinitesimal gauge symmetry for the graviton in the AdS_5 space-time background,

$$\delta \hat{h}_{\alpha\beta} = \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha^{(0)} \hat{\xi}_\beta + \widehat{\nabla}_\beta^{(0)} \hat{\xi}_\alpha, \tag{268}$$

where the covariant derivative $\nabla_\alpha^{(0)}$ is defined with respect to the AdS_5 metric $g_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)}$. To verify the masslessness of the graviton $\hat{h}_{\alpha\beta}$ in AdS_5 space, we observe the equation of motion derived from the action (266) [114],

$$E_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left(\widehat{\nabla}^\gamma \widehat{\nabla}_\gamma \hat{h}_{\alpha\beta} - \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \widehat{\nabla}_\gamma \hat{h}^\gamma_\beta - \widehat{\nabla}_\beta \widehat{\nabla}_\gamma \hat{h}^\gamma_\alpha + \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \widehat{\nabla}_\beta \hat{h} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{g}_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)} \left(\widehat{\nabla}_\gamma \widehat{\nabla}_\delta \hat{h}^{\gamma\delta} - \widehat{\nabla}^\gamma \widehat{\nabla}_\gamma \hat{h} \right) - \frac{2}{l^2} \left(\hat{h}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{g}_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)} \hat{h} \right) = 0. \quad (269)$$

$\hat{h}_{\alpha\beta}$ contain non-physical modes due to the local symmetry (268) and the physical ones should be the traceless and divergence-free (i.e., transverse and traceless) part of $\hat{h}_{\alpha\beta}$. Eq. (269) gives the identity, $\widehat{\nabla}_\beta^{(0)} E^{\alpha\beta} = 0$. This equation together gauge-fixing condition $\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha^{(0)} \hat{h}^{\alpha\beta} = 0$ gives exactly the right physical degrees of freedom for the massless graviton in the AdS_5 space.

When fractional $D3$ -branes switch on, the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background get deformed by R-R- and NS-NS three-form fluxes carried by fractional branes. The isometric symmetries of the deformed AdS_5 and $T^{1,1}$ reduce. As explained above, when we consider type IIB supergravity in this background, the compactification on deformed $T^{1,1}$ occurs, and the isometric symmetries of the deformed AdS_5 and $T^{1,1}$ convert into the space-time- and gauge symmetries for the compactified theory. Therefore, less symmetries appear in the compactified theory than the case of type IIB supergravity in the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background. This phenomenon can be considered as the spontaneous breaking of local symmetry in the gauged AdS_5 supergravity [111]. The broken symmetry should be the symmetry corresponding to conformal supersymmetry on field theory side, and the symmetry corresponding to Poincaré supersymmetry should still persist. Further, the Higgs effect should take place since those broken symmetries are local ones in the gauged AdS_5 supergravity. In the following we demonstrate how the Higgs mechanism corresponding to the spontaneous breaking of local symmetry $SO(2, 4)$ to $SO(1, 4)$ happens.

We start from type IIB supergravity in ten dimensions and consider the Einstein-Hilbert-, self-dual five-form $F_{(5)}$ and NS-NS two-form $B_{(2)}$ terms listed in Eq. (253) ¹⁰,

$$S_{\text{IIB}} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \bar{E} \left(\bar{R} - \frac{1}{2 \times 3!} H_{(3)MNP} H_{(3)}^{MNP} - \frac{1}{4 \times 5!} F_{(5)MNPQR} F_{(5)}^{MNPQR} \right). \quad (270)$$

The Einstein equation derived from the above classical action is

$$\bar{R}_{MN} = \frac{1}{96} F_{(5)MPQRS} F_{(5)N}{}^{PQRS} + \frac{1}{4} \left(H_{(3)MPQ} H_{(3)N}{}^{PQ} - \frac{1}{12} G_{MN} H_{(3)PQR} H_{(3)}^{PQR} \right). \quad (271)$$

This equation of motion shows clearly that without the three-form field $H_{(3)PQR}$, the self-dual five-form flux should lead to a three-brane solution whose near-horizon limit is $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ if the flat limit is $M^4 \times \mathcal{C}_6$ [109], while the presence of three-form flux deforms the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ and leads to a less symmetric vacuum configuration for type IIB supergravity. According to

¹⁰For the simplicity of discussion we do not consider the R-R three-form sector.

the general idea of the Higgs mechanism, we should make the vacuum configuration symmetric by performing a gauge transformation which re-parametrises the field variable. This can be done by shifting the Ricci curvature and absorbing the three-form flux contribution into the shifted Ricci curvature. Thus we define

$$R \equiv \overline{R} - \frac{1}{2 \times 3!} H_{(3)MNP} H_{(3)}^{MNP}. \quad (272)$$

Consequently, the above Einstein equation becomes the one with only the five-form flux as the matter source,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{MN} &\equiv \overline{R}_{MN} - \frac{1}{4} \left(H_{(3)MPQ} H_{(3)N}{}^{PQ} - \frac{1}{12} G_{MN} H_{(3)PQR} H_{(3)}^{PQR} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{96} F_{(5)MPQRS} F_{(5)N}{}^{PQRS}. \end{aligned} \quad (273)$$

It will give the three-brane solution whose near horizon limit is $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$. Eq. (273) also means a shift of the Riemannian curvature,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{KMLN} &= \overline{R}_{KMLN} - \frac{1}{4} \left[H_{(3)KMQ} H_{(3)LN}{}^Q \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{12 \times 9} (G_{KL} G_{MN} - G_{KN} G_{ML}) H_{(3)PQR} H_{(3)}^{PQR} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (274)$$

In the following we expand the gravitational field around this “shifted” $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ vacuum configuration. Just like revealing the Higgs phenomenon in gauge theory, h_{MN} must undergo a gauge transformation, which makes h_{MN} pick up a longitudinal component and become massive. That is, we have the following operation on background metrics and graviton fields,

$$G_{MN} = \overline{G}_{MN}^{(0)} + h_{MN} = G_{MN}^{(0)} + \overline{h}_{MN}, \quad (275)$$

where $G_{MN}^{(0)}$ and $\overline{G}_{MN}^{(0)}$ denote the symmetric and deformed $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ metrics, respectively, $\overline{h}_{MN}$ and h_{MN} are graviton excitations around these space-time background metrics, respectively.

The above discussion is a qualitative analysis in ten dimensions. In the following we go to five-dimensions. Using the explicit form of the K-T solution, we can find the explicit conversion between the undeformed and deformed AdS_5 geometry. The deformed AdS_5 background in the K-T solution (216) is

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{d-AdS_5}^2 &= \widehat{\overline{g}}_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)} dx^\alpha dx^\beta \approx \frac{r^2}{L^2} [1 - A(r)] \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + \frac{L^2}{r^2} [1 + A(r)] dr^2, \\ A(r) &= \frac{3}{4\pi} \frac{M^2}{N} g_s \left(\frac{1}{4} + \ln \frac{r}{r_0} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (276)$$

The logarithmic dependence on the radial coordinate in the deformed AdS_5 space-time background means that the $SO(2,4)$ isometry symmetry of AdS_5 space breaks to $SO(1,4)$.

The $(\alpha\beta)$ component of Eqs. (273) and the explicit form of NS-NS two-form $B_{(2)}$ given in (216) determine that the deformed AdS_5 vacuum background $\widehat{\overline{g}}_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)}$ can be restored back to the AdS_5 metric $\widehat{g}_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)}$ by the diffeomorphism transformation,

$$\widehat{g}_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)} = \widehat{g}_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)} - \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha^{(0)} \widehat{B}_\beta - \widehat{\nabla}_\beta^{(0)} \widehat{B}_\alpha. \quad (277)$$

In above equation $\widehat{B}_\alpha$ is a newly defined vector field relevant to the NS-NS two-form field $B_{(2)}$ in the K-S solution,

$$\widehat{B}_\alpha = \partial_\alpha \left[G \int_{S^2} B_{(2)} \right], \quad (278)$$

where G , as F in (259), is a function in ten dimensions. The restored space-time background metric $\widehat{g}_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)}$ now becomes invariant under the following diffeomorphism transformation in the AdS_5 space-time,

$$\delta x^\alpha = -\widehat{\xi}^\alpha, \quad \delta \widehat{B}_\alpha = -\widehat{\xi}_\alpha. \quad (279)$$

Therefore, the AdS_5 space-time background is re-gained and the full $SO(2,4)$ space-time symmetry is recovered. A straightforward observation for this symmetry restoration is that $\widehat{B}_\alpha$ provides a compensation to the non-symmetric part since $\widehat{B}_\alpha$ also has $\ln(r/r_0)$ dependence.

Eqs. (275) and (277) determine that in the restored AdS_5 space-time background the graviton $\widehat{h}_{\alpha\beta}$ is related to the graviton $\widehat{h}_{\alpha\beta}$ in the deformed AdS_5 space-time as the following,

$$\widehat{h}_{\alpha\beta} = \widehat{h}_{\alpha\beta} + \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha^{(0)} \widehat{B}_\beta + \widehat{\nabla}_\beta^{(0)} \widehat{B}_\alpha. \quad (280)$$

Hence it picks up a longitudinal component. This shows that $\widehat{B}_\alpha$ plays the role of a Goldstone vector field in the AdS_5 space [115].

Based on above analysis, we expand the classical action (270) to the second order of graviton $h_{\alpha\beta}$ around the symmetric AdS_5 background. Furthermore, as in usual gauge theory, all of other fields such as $B_{(2)}$ must be replaced by their $SO(2,4)$ transformed versions if they belong to certain non-trivial representations of $SO(2,4)$. The quadratic action of type IIB supergravity in the deformed $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background can be recast into the one around the symmetric $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ vacuum configuration,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{S}_{\text{Q.G.}} &= \frac{1}{2k_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^{(0)}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \nabla^P \overline{h}^{MN} \nabla_P \overline{h}_{MN} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^P \overline{h}^{MN} \nabla_M \overline{h}_{PN} \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \nabla^M \overline{h} \left(\nabla_M \overline{h} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^N \overline{h}_{MN} \right) + \frac{27}{32} \frac{\pi \alpha'^2 N}{\overline{h}^2(r) r^5} \left(\overline{h}^{MN} \overline{h}_{MN} - \frac{1}{2} \overline{h}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left[R_{MPNQ}^{(0)} - \frac{1}{90} \left(G_{MN}^{(0)} G_{PQ}^{(0)} - G_{MQ}^{(0)} G_{NP}^{(0)} \right) \frac{1}{2 \times 3!} H_{(3)RST}^{(0)} H_{(3)}^{(0)RST} \right] \overline{h}^{MN} \overline{h}^{PQ} \Big\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2k_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^{(0)}} \left[-\frac{1}{4} \nabla^P \overline{h}^{MN} \nabla_P \overline{h}_{MN} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_M \overline{h}^{MN} \nabla^P \overline{h}_{PN} \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \nabla^M \overline{h} \left(\nabla_M \overline{h} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^N \overline{h}_{MN} \right) - \frac{9}{32} \frac{\pi \alpha'^2 N}{\overline{h}^2(r) r^5} \left(\overline{h}^{MN} \overline{h}_{MN} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{h}^2 \right) \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{4} \times \frac{1}{2 \times 45} \left(\frac{3g_s M \alpha'}{4} \right)^2 \frac{72}{r^6 \overline{h}^{3/2}(r)} \left(\overline{h}^{MN} \overline{h}_{MN} - \overline{h}^2 \right) \right]. \quad (281) \end{aligned}$$

The last term indicates the arising of the celebrated Pauli-Fierz mass term for the graviton in AdS_5 space [116].

Performing compactification on $T^{1,1}$ and taking into account only zero modes in the K-K spectrum, we obtain the massive AdS_5 graviton due to the partially spontaneous breaking of local diffeomorphism symmetry in AdS_5 space-time,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}_{\text{q.g.}} = & \frac{1}{2k_5^2} \int d^5x \sqrt{-\hat{g}^{(0)}} \left[-\frac{1}{4} \widehat{\nabla}^\gamma \widehat{h}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\nabla}_\gamma \widehat{h}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\nabla}^\gamma \widehat{h}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \widehat{h}_{\gamma\beta} \right. \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \widehat{\nabla}^\alpha \widehat{h} \left(\widehat{\nabla}_\alpha \widehat{h} - \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\nabla}^\beta \widehat{h}_{\alpha\beta} \right) - \frac{1}{L^2} \left(\widehat{h}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{h}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \widehat{h}^2 \right) \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{4} m^2 \left(\widehat{h}^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{h}_{\alpha\beta} - \widehat{h}^2 \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (282)$$

The mass m can be explicitly evaluated through integrating over the internal manifold $T^{1,1}$.

E. Dual of γ -trace Anomaly $\gamma_\mu s^\mu$ of Supersymmetry Current

In this section we investigate the gravity dual of γ -trace anomaly of supersymmetry current s_μ . As discussed in Sect.V, the breaking or preservation of supersymmetry by the K-S solution can be detected by observing the Killing spinor equation deduced from supersymmetry transformations on graviton Ψ_M and dilatino Λ in the space-time background described by the K-S solution. The Killing spinor equations in $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background is listed in Eq. (226),

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{10} \delta \Lambda &= 0 \\ \kappa_{10} \delta \Psi_M &= \left(\partial_M + \frac{1}{4} \omega_M^{AB} \Gamma^{AB} \right) \epsilon + \frac{i}{480} \kappa_{10} \Gamma^{PQRST} F_{(5)PQRST} \Gamma_M \epsilon = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (283)$$

On the other hand, Eq. (233) gives the Killing spinor equation in the deformed $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{10} \delta \Lambda &= -\frac{i}{24} \kappa_{10} \left(F_{(3)MNP} + i H_{(3)MNP} \right) \Gamma^{MNP} \epsilon = 0, \\ \kappa_{10} \delta \Psi_M &= \left(\partial_M + \frac{1}{4} \omega_M^{AB} \Gamma^{AB} \right) \epsilon \\ &+ \frac{i}{480} \kappa_{10} \Gamma^{PQRST} \Gamma_M \epsilon \left(\overline{F}_{(5)PQRST} - \frac{5}{4} \kappa_{10} C_{[(2)PQ} H_{(3)RST]} + \frac{5}{4} \kappa_{10} B_{[(2)PQ} F_{(3)RST]} \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{96} \kappa_{10} \left[\Gamma_M^{NPQ} \left(F_{(3)NPQ} + i H_{(3)NPQ} \right) - 9 \Gamma^{NP} \left(F_{(3)MNP} + i H_{(3)MNP} \right) \right] \epsilon^\star \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (284)$$

Now we employ the same idea as looking for the dual of scale anomaly to find the dual description to γ -trace anomaly of supersymmetry current. That is, we should define new Λ and Ψ_M and make the Killing spinor equation (233) (or (284)) in deformed $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background recover to the form of Eq. (226) (or (283)).

A straightforward comparison between Eq. (283) and Eq. (284) implies that that we should introduce a complex right-handed Weyl spinor Υ and define

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda' &\equiv \Lambda - 4i\Upsilon, \\ \Psi'_M &\equiv \Psi_M - \Gamma_M \Upsilon.\end{aligned}\tag{285}$$

Then we use the identities of Γ -matrix in ten dimensions,

$$\begin{aligned}\{\Gamma_M, \Gamma_N\} &= 2g_{MN}, \\ \Gamma_{M_1 M_2 \dots M_n} &= \Gamma_{[M_1} \Gamma_{M_2} \dots \Gamma_{M_n]} = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_P (-1)^{\delta_P} \Gamma_{a_{P(1)}} \Gamma_{a_{P(2)}} \dots \Gamma_{a_{P(n)}}, \\ \Gamma_{M_1 M_2 \dots M_n N} &= \Gamma_{M_1 M_2 \dots M_n} \Gamma_N - n \Gamma_{[M_1 M_2 \dots M_{n-1}} G_{M_n] N}, \\ \Gamma_{N M_1 M_2 \dots M_n} &= \Gamma_N \Gamma_{M_1 M_2 \dots M_n} - n G_{N [M_1} \Gamma_{M_1 M_2 \dots M_n]},\end{aligned}\tag{286}$$

and assign the supersymmetry transformation of Υ as the following,

$$\delta\Upsilon = -\frac{1}{96} \left(F_{(3)MNP} + iH_{(3)MNP} \right) \Gamma^{MNP} \epsilon.\tag{287}$$

In this way, the supersymmetry transformation (283) will be reproduced from (284) (up to the linear terms in fermionic fields and to the first order in the gravitational coupling κ_{10}). Later we shall see that after the compactification on $T^{1,1}$, Υ will lead to the Goldstone fermion. This Goldstone fermionic field should arise when the NS-NS- and R-R three-form fluxes breaks one-half of local supersymmetries. Indeed, we can see that the supersymmetric transformation for the compactified Υ is proportional to the transformation parameter with the proportionality coefficient given by the three-form fluxes passing through S^3 . This is a typical feature of the Goldstone fermion [118].

To show how the super-Higgs effect takes place, we consider the quadratic part of the gravitino action of type IIB supergravity,

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\text{gravitino}} &= \frac{1}{2k_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x E \left[-\frac{i}{2} \bar{\Psi}_M \Gamma^{MNP} D_N \Psi_P \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{8 \times 5!} \bar{\Psi}_M \Gamma^{MNP} \left(\Gamma^{UVWXY} F_{(5)UVWXY} \right) \Gamma_N \Psi_P + \dots \right].\end{aligned}\tag{288}$$

When the fractional D3-branes are absent, the space-time background is $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ with the self-dual five-form field strength,

$$F_{x_0 x_1 x_2 x_3 r} = \frac{r^3}{g_s L^4}, \quad F_{g_1 g_2 g_3 g_4 g_5} = \frac{L^4}{27 g_s}.\tag{289}$$

We put above fermionic action in the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background. As stated above, the compactification on $T^{1,1}$ will take place. The compactification of fermionic fields in type IIB supergravity was processed as the following [18]. First, the explicit representation for Dirac matrices Γ^A in ten dimensions should be specified [112,18],

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^A &= E^A_M \Gamma^M, \quad \Gamma^a = \hat{\gamma}^a \otimes 1_4 \otimes \sigma^1, \quad \Gamma^m = 1_4 \otimes \tau^m \otimes (-\sigma^2), \\ M &= (a, \xi), \quad A = (a, m), \quad a = 0, \dots, 4, \quad m = 5, \dots, 9,\end{aligned}\tag{290}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\Gamma^A, \Gamma^B\} &= 2\eta^{AB}, \quad \{\hat{\gamma}^a, \hat{\gamma}^b\} = 2\eta^{ab}, \quad \{\tau^m, \tau^n\} = 2\delta^{mn}, \\
\hat{\gamma}^0 &= -\hat{\gamma}_0 = i\sigma^1 \otimes 1_2 = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1_2 \\ 1_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\gamma}^i = \hat{\gamma}_i = \sigma^2 \otimes \sigma^i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\sigma^i \\ -i\sigma^i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\hat{\gamma}^4 &= \hat{\gamma}_4 = i\hat{\gamma}^0 \hat{\gamma}^1 \hat{\gamma}^2 \hat{\gamma}^3 = \sigma^3 \otimes 1_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3; \\
\tau^5 &= \tau_5 = i\hat{\gamma}_0, \quad \tau^6 = \tau_6 = \hat{\gamma}_1, \quad \tau^7 = \tau_7 = \hat{\gamma}_2, \quad \tau^8 = \tau_8 = \hat{\gamma}_3, \quad \tau^9 = \tau_9 = \hat{\gamma}_4.
\end{aligned} \tag{291}$$

In above equations, γ^a and τ^m denote the Dirac matrices in AdS_5 space and $T^{1,1}$, respectively. The above choice on Γ -matrices determine an explicit form for the four-dimensional γ_5 -analogue in ten dimensions,

$$\Gamma^{11} = \Gamma_{11} = \Gamma^0 \Gamma^1 \cdots \Gamma^9 = 1_4 \otimes 1_4 \otimes \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{16} & 0 \\ 0 & -1_{16} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{292}$$

Consequently, the left-handed gravitino Ψ_M , the supersymmetry transformation parameter ϵ and the right-handed dilatino Λ decompose as the following,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_\alpha(x, y) &= \psi_\alpha(x, y) \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_\alpha(x, y) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Psi_\xi(x, y) &= \psi_\xi(x, y) \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_\xi(x, y) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Lambda(x, y) &= \lambda(x, y) \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \lambda(x, y) \end{pmatrix}, \\
\epsilon(x, y) &= \tilde{\epsilon}(x, y) \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\epsilon}(x, y) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Upsilon(x, y) &= \tilde{\chi}(x, y) \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \tilde{\chi}(x, y) \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{293}$$

where x^α, y^ξ are the coordinates on AdS_5 and $T^{1,1}$, respectively, and $\psi_\alpha, \psi_\xi, \tilde{\lambda}$ and $\tilde{\eta}$ are 16-component Weyl spinor fields in ten dimensions. Further, we expand these field functions and the local supersymmetry transformation parameter in terms of the four-component $SO(5)$ spinor harmonics $\Xi^{(j,l,r)}(y)$, and they can be further decomposed into the one-dimensional $U_H(1)$ -harmonics $Y_q^{(j,l,r)}$ on $T^{1,1}$ [112],

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_\alpha(x, y) &= \sum_{j,l,r} \hat{\psi}_\alpha^{(j,l,r)}(x) \Xi^{(j,l,r)}(y) = \sum_{j,l,r} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\psi}_\alpha^{(j,l,r-1)}(x) Y_0^{(j,l,r-1)}(y) \\ \hat{\psi}_\alpha^{(j,l,r+1)}(x) Y_0^{(j,l,r+1)}(y) \\ \hat{\psi}_\alpha^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_{-1}^{(j,l,r)}(y) \\ \hat{\psi}_\alpha^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_{+1}^{(j,l,r)}(y) \end{pmatrix}, \\
\lambda(x, y) &= \sum_{j,l,r} \hat{\lambda}^{(j,l,r)}(x) \Xi^{(j,l,r)}(y) = \sum_{j,l,r} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\lambda}^{(j,l,r-1)}(x) Y_0^{(j,l,r-1)}(y) \\ \hat{\lambda}^{(j,l,r+1)}(x) Y_0^{(j,l,r+1)}(y) \\ \hat{\lambda}^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_{-1}^{(j,l,r)}(y) \\ \hat{\lambda}^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_{+1}^{(j,l,r)}(y) \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\epsilon}(x, y) &= \sum_{j,l,r} \tilde{\epsilon}^{(j,l,r)}(x) \Xi^{(j,l,r)}(y) = \sum_{j,l,r} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\epsilon}^{(j,l,r-1)}(x) Y_0^{(j,l,r-1)}(y) \\ \tilde{\epsilon}^{(j,l,r+1)}(x) Y_0^{(j,l,r+1)}(y) \\ \tilde{\epsilon}^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_{-1}^{(j,l,r)}(y) \\ \tilde{\epsilon}^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_{+1}^{(j,l,r)}(y) \end{pmatrix}, \\
\tilde{\chi}(x, y) &= \sum_{j,l,r} \tilde{\chi}^{(j,l,r)}(x) \Xi^{(j,l,r)}(y) = \sum_{j,l,r} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\chi}^{(j,l,r-1)}(x) Y_0^{(j,l,r-1)}(y) \\ \tilde{\chi}^{(j,l,r+1)}(x) Y_0^{(j,l,r+1)}(y) \\ \tilde{\chi}^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_{-1}^{(j,l,r)}(y) \\ \tilde{\chi}^{(j,l,r)}(x) Y_{+1}^{(j,l,r)}(y) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{294}$$

In Eq. (294) $\tilde{\psi}_\alpha^{(j,l,r)}(x)$, $\tilde{\lambda}^{(j,l,r)}(x)$, $\tilde{\epsilon}^{(j,l,r)}(x)$ and $\tilde{\chi}^{(j,l,r)}(x)$ are the four-component spinor fields on AdS_5 ; $\Xi^{(j,l,r)}(y)$ are the four-component $SO(5)$ spinor harmonics on $T^{1,1}$, and $Y_q^{(j,l,r)}(y)$ are the $U_H(1)$ -harmonics with $U_H(1)$ -charge q . Substituting the chiral decomposition (293) and further the $U_H(1)$ -harmonic expansions for Ψ_α and Λ into their linearized equations of motion and further taking into account only zero modes of the corresponding kinetic operators on $T^{1,1}$, one can obtain the following quadratic action for the gravitino of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity [112],

$$S_{\text{gravitino}} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_5^2} \int d^5x e \left[-\frac{i}{2} \bar{\psi}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} \widehat{D}_\beta \hat{\psi}_{i\gamma} + \frac{3}{4L} \bar{\psi}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\psi}_{i\beta} + \dots \right]. \tag{295}$$

Eq. (295) is the action for the massless gravitino of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity, and the second mass-like term is required by supersymmetry to accompany the cosmological term in AdS_5 space [117]; ψ_α^i is the $SU(2)$ symplectic Majorana spinor and the indices $i = 1, 2$ label two gravitini of R -charges $r = \pm 1$, which arise automatically when the compactification on $T^{1,1}$ is performed [112].

Now we come to the case with fractional branes. The $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background is deformed by the three-form fluxes carried by fractional branes. The gravitino action (288) can be expressed in terms of either Ψ_M , Λ in the deformed $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background or the shifted fields Ψ'_M and Λ' in the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background. We focus on the second term of (288) and re-write it in terms of the shifted fermionic fields shown (285). Up to the leading order of κ_{10} , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{S}_{\text{gravitino}} &= \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \bar{E} \left[-\frac{1}{8 \times 5!} \bar{\Psi}_M \Gamma^{MNP} \left(\Gamma^{UVWXY} \bar{F}_{(5)UVWXY} \right) \Gamma_N \Psi_P + \dots \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x E \left(-\frac{1}{8 \times 5!} \right) \left(\bar{\Psi}'_M + \bar{\Upsilon} \Gamma_M \right) \Gamma^{MNP} \left(\Gamma^{(5)} \cdot \tilde{F}_{(5)} \right) \Gamma_N \left(\Psi'_P - \Gamma_P \Upsilon \right) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \frac{1}{5!} \int d^{10}x E \left[\frac{1}{4} \bar{\Psi}'_\alpha \Gamma^{\alpha\beta} \left(\Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} - \Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \right) \Psi'_\beta \right. \\
&\quad + \bar{\Psi}'_\alpha \Gamma^\alpha \Gamma^\xi \left(\Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} - \Gamma^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \right) \Psi'_\xi \\
&\quad + \bar{\Upsilon} \Gamma^\alpha \left(\Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} - \Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \right) \Psi'_\alpha - \bar{\Psi}'_\alpha \Gamma^\alpha \left(\Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} + \Gamma^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \right) \Upsilon \\
&\quad - \bar{\Psi}'_\xi \Gamma^\xi \left(\Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} + \Gamma^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \right) \Upsilon + \bar{\Upsilon} \Gamma^\xi \left(\Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} - \Gamma^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \right) \Psi'_\xi \\
&\quad - 2 \times 5 \times 5 \bar{\Upsilon} \Gamma^\alpha \left(\Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} + \Gamma^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \right) \Upsilon \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{4} \bar{\Psi}'_\xi \Gamma^{\xi\varepsilon} \left(\Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} - \Gamma^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \right) \Psi'_\varepsilon \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{296}$$

where we have decomposed the ten-dimensional components of the fields into those on AdS_5 and $T^{1,1}$ and used the following identities,

$$\begin{aligned} [\Gamma^\alpha, \Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5}] \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} &= \left(5g^{\alpha[\alpha_1} \Gamma^{\alpha_2 \dots \alpha_5]} - 5\Gamma^{[\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_4} g^{\alpha_5]\alpha} \right) \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \\ &= 5g^{\alpha\alpha_1} \Gamma_{\alpha_1} - 5g^{\alpha\alpha_1} \Gamma_{\alpha_1} = 0, \\ [\Gamma^\xi, \Gamma^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5}] \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} &= [\Gamma^{\xi\varepsilon}, \Gamma^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5}] \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} = [\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}, \Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5}] \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (297)$$

Further, according to the explicit representations of Γ -matrices listed in (290) and (291), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} &= -i\epsilon^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} 1_4 \otimes 1_4 \otimes \sigma_1, \quad \Gamma^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} = -\epsilon^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} 1_4 \otimes 1_4 \otimes \sigma_2, \\ \Gamma^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \pm \Gamma^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \\ &= -i1_4 \otimes 1_4 \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \epsilon^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \mp \epsilon^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \\ \epsilon^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \pm \epsilon^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (298)$$

Substituting (298) and the Weyl spinor representations (293) into the action (296), we can reduce $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{gravitino}}$ to the following,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{gravitino}} &= \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \frac{i}{5!} \int d^{10}x E \left[\left(\frac{1}{4} \overline{\psi}_\alpha (1_4 \otimes \gamma^{\alpha\beta}) \psi_\beta - 2\overline{\psi}_\alpha (1_4 \otimes \gamma^\alpha) \chi + 5\overline{\chi} \chi \right) \right. \\ &\quad \times \left(\epsilon^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} - \epsilon^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \right) \Big] \\ &= -\frac{i}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G_{10}} \left[\frac{3}{L} \frac{1}{g_s} \left(1 + \frac{3}{2\pi} \frac{g_s M^2}{N} \ln \frac{r}{r_0} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \left(\frac{1}{4} \overline{\psi}_\alpha (1_4 \otimes \gamma^{\alpha\beta}) \psi_\beta - 2\overline{\psi}_\alpha (1_4 \otimes \gamma^\alpha) \chi + 5\overline{\chi} \chi \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (299)$$

In above derivation we have used

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{5!} \left(\epsilon^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} \tilde{F}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_5} - \epsilon^{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \tilde{F}_{\xi_1 \dots \xi_5} \right) \\ &= -\sqrt{-g_{AdS_5}} F_{0123r} - \sqrt{g_{T^{1,1}}} F_{g^1 g^2 g^3 g^4 g^5} \\ &= -3h^{-5/4}(r) \frac{27}{4} \frac{\pi \alpha'^2 N_{\text{eff}}}{r^5} \\ &= -\frac{3}{L} \frac{1}{g_s} \left(1 + \frac{3}{2\pi} \frac{g_s M^2}{N} \ln \frac{r}{r_0} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (300)$$

Eq. (299) shows the sign of super-Higgs effects in the gauged AdS_5 supergravity [118]. Finally, substituting the $U_H(1)$ -harmonic expansions (294) for ψ_α and χ into (299) and integrating over the internal manifold $T^{1,1}$, we obtain the five-dimensional gauged supergravity from the compactification on $T^{1,1}$. If only the contributions from zero-modes are taken into account, Eq. (299) yields the following terms of the five-dimensional gauged supergravity,

$$\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{gravitino}} = -\frac{i}{2\kappa_5^2} \int d^5x \sqrt{-\hat{g}^{(0)}} \left(\frac{3}{4L} \frac{1}{g_s} + m \right) \left(-\overline{\hat{\psi}}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\psi}_{i\beta} - 8\overline{\hat{\psi}}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^\alpha \hat{\chi}_i + 20\overline{\hat{\chi}}^i \hat{\chi}_i \right). \quad (301)$$

Finally, making a shift

$$\hat{\psi}_\alpha^{i'} = \hat{\psi}_\alpha^i - \hat{\gamma}_\alpha \hat{\chi}^i, \quad (302)$$

in above equation, we obtain an elegant result,

$$\bar{S}_{\text{gravitino}} = -\frac{i}{2\kappa_5^2} \int d^5x \sqrt{-\hat{g}^{(0)}} \left(\frac{3}{4L} \frac{1}{g_s} + m \right) \bar{\psi}_\alpha^{i'} \hat{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\psi}_\beta^{i'}. \quad (303)$$

In above action, the first term with coefficient proportional to $1/(Lg_s)$ is the term accompanying cosmological constant term, which is required by the supersymmetry in AdS_5 space [117]; The second one is the mass term for the gravitino of five-dimensional gauged supergravity. This mass is generated by the super-Higgs mechanism and is proportional to fluxes M carried by the fractional branes, which can be seen clearly from Eq. (299).

F. $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Goldstone Chiral Supermultiplet on AdS_5 Boundary

We have shown that the superconformal anomaly multiplet of an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(N+M) \times SU(N)$ supersymmetric gauge theory in four dimensions is dual to the spontaneous breaking of local supersymmetry from $\mathcal{N} = 2$ to $\mathcal{N} = 1$ and the consequent super-Higgs mechanism in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauged AdS_5 supergravity, through which the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ graviton supermultiplet $(\hat{h}_{\alpha\beta}, \hat{\psi}_\alpha^i, \hat{A}_\alpha)$ becomes massive. A crucial ingredient in implementing this super-Higgs mechanism is the Goldstone fields θ , B_α and Υ in ten dimensions, which are defined in Eqs. (259), (278) and (285) and (287). Since the superconformal anomaly in an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ four-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theory constitutes an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ chiral supermultiplet [9,10]. Therefore, the gauge/gravity dual means that θ , B_α and Υ should constitute a supermultiplet. Further, according to the holographic version on AdS/CFT correspondence at the supergravity level [3,4], θ , B_α and Υ after the compactification on $T^{1,1}$ should form an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Goldstone supermultiplet in five dimensions and its AdS_5 boundary value should be an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ chiral supermultiplet in four dimensions. This fact can be verified as the following. First, we make use of the supersymmetric transformations for $B_{(2)MN}$ and $F_{(3)MNP}$ in type IIB supergravity [106],

$$\begin{aligned} \delta G_{(3)MNP} &= 3\partial_{[M}\delta A_{(2)NP]} \\ &= \delta \left[F_{(3)MNP} + iH_{(3)MNP} \right] \\ &= 3\partial_{[M}\delta C_{(2)NP]} + 3i\partial_{[M}\delta B_{(2)NP]} \\ &= 3\partial_{[M}\bar{\epsilon}\Gamma_{NP]}\Lambda - 12i\partial_{[M}\bar{\epsilon}^*\Gamma_N\Psi_{P]}. \end{aligned} \quad (304)$$

This implies that locally there should exist

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A_{(2)NP} &= \delta C_{(2)NP} + i\delta B_{(2)NP} \\ &= \bar{\epsilon}\Gamma_{NP}\Lambda - 2i\bar{\epsilon}^*(\Gamma_N\Psi_P - \Gamma_P\Psi_N). \end{aligned} \quad (305)$$

When we restore the deformed $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ back to the symmetric $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ vacuum background, the fermionic fields Ψ_M and Λ are reparametrized as shown in (285), the above supersymmetric transformation becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta A'_{(2)NP} &\equiv \delta A_{(2)NP} + \delta A_{(2)NP}^{(\Upsilon)} \\
&= \delta C'_{(2)NP} + i\delta B'_{(2)NP} \\
&= \bar{\epsilon}\Gamma_{NP}(\Lambda - 4i\Upsilon) - 2i\bar{\epsilon}^*[\Gamma_N(\Psi_P - \Gamma_P\Upsilon) - \Gamma_P(\Psi_N - \Gamma_P\Upsilon)] \\
&= \bar{\epsilon}\Gamma_{NP}\Lambda - 2i\bar{\epsilon}^*(\Gamma_N\Psi_P - \Gamma_P\Psi_N) - 4i(\bar{\epsilon} - \bar{\epsilon}^*)\Gamma_{NP}\Upsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{306}$$

where we use $A_{(2)NP}^{(\Upsilon)}$ to represent the parts of $B_{(2)MN}$ and $C_{(2)MN}$ whose supersymmetric transformations depend only on Υ due to the shift on fermionic fields. Eq. (306) yields the following supersymmetric transformation involving the Goldstone spinor Υ ,

$$\delta A_{(2)NP}^{(\Upsilon)} = -4i(\bar{\epsilon} - \bar{\epsilon}^*)\Gamma_{NP}\Upsilon = 4(\text{Im } \bar{\epsilon})\Gamma_{NP}\Upsilon. \tag{307}$$

We turn to the supersymmetric transformation of Υ given in (287),

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\Upsilon &= -\frac{1}{96} \times 3 \partial_{[M} A_{(2)NP]}^{(\Upsilon)} \Gamma^{MNP} \epsilon \\
&= -\frac{1}{96} \times 3 \left(\partial_{[M} C_{(2)NP]}^{(\Upsilon)} + i\partial_{[M} B_{(2)NP]}^{(\Upsilon)} \right) \Gamma^{MNP} \epsilon \\
&= -\frac{1}{32} \Gamma^M \left(\partial_M A_{(2)NP}^{(\Upsilon)} \right) \Gamma^{NP} \epsilon,
\end{aligned} \tag{308}$$

where the following identity among Γ -matrix in ten dimensions is used,

$$\Gamma^{MNP} = \Gamma^M \Gamma^{NP} - (G^{MN} \Gamma^P - G^{MP} \Gamma^N). \tag{309}$$

Eqs. (307) and (308) show that $A_{(2)NP}^{(\Upsilon)}$ and Υ constitute a supermultiplet in ten dimensions since their supersymmetric transformations form a closed algebra.

Further, from the definitions on Goldstone bosons given in (259) and (280),

$$\theta = F \int_{S^2} C_{(2)}, \quad B_\alpha = \partial_\alpha \left[G \int_{S^2} B_{(2)} \right] \equiv \partial_\alpha \omega, \tag{310}$$

we choose $F = G$ ¹¹ and define a new complex scalar field in ten dimensions,

$$\varphi \equiv \theta + i\omega = F \left[\int_{S^2} (C_{(2)} + iB_{(2)}) \right]. \tag{311}$$

Since in the K-S solution both $C_{(2)}$ and $B_{(2)}$ are proportional to $\omega_2 = (g^1 \wedge g^2 + g^3 \wedge g^4)/2$, the complex scalar field φ defined in (311) actually contains two complex (four real) scalar fields,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi^1 &\sim \int_{S^2} (C_{(2)g_1g_2} + iB_{(2)g_1g_2}), \\
\varphi^2 &\sim \int_{S^2} (C_{(2)g_3g_4} + iB_{(2)g_3g_4}).
\end{aligned} \tag{312}$$

¹¹This choice is always possible since in (259) and (280) F and G are introduced as arbitrary field functions in ten-dimensions. Actually, the requirement that the Goldstone fields should constitute a supermultiplet imposes this choice.

Consequently, the supersymmetric transformations (307) and (308) for the Goldstone multiplet $(A_{(2)NP}^{(\Upsilon)}, \Upsilon)$ reduce to the following forms,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\varphi^1 &= 4 (\text{Im } \bar{\epsilon}) \Gamma_{g_1 g_2} \tilde{\Upsilon}, \\ \delta\varphi^2 &= 4 (\text{Im } \bar{\epsilon}) \Gamma_{g_3 g_4} \tilde{\Upsilon}, \\ \delta\tilde{\Upsilon} &= -\frac{1}{32} \Gamma^M \left[(\partial_M \varphi^1) \Gamma_{g_1 g_2} + (\partial_M \varphi^2) \Gamma_{g_3 g_4} \right] \epsilon, \\ \tilde{\Upsilon} &\equiv \int_{S^2} \Upsilon.\end{aligned}\tag{313}$$

Further, recall that Υ and its supersymmetric transformation (287) are introduced to counter the supersymmetric transformation in the K-S solution background so that the Killing spinor equation (284) can be restored back to the Killing spinor equation (283) in the $AdS_5 \times T^{1,1}$ background. Therefore, the supersymmetry transformation parameter ϵ in (307)-(313) should satisfy the constraint equations (239). Since we use the UV (large- τ) limit of the K-S solution (i.e., the K-T solution), Eq. (239) yields

$$\Gamma_{g_1 g_2} \epsilon = -\Gamma_{g_3 g_4} \epsilon = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} i \left(\frac{\sinh \tau}{\cosh \tau} - \frac{1}{\cosh \tau} \Gamma_{g_1 g_3} \right) \epsilon = i\epsilon.\tag{314}$$

So finally we get an elegant form for the supersymmetric transformation of the Goldstone multiplet without resorting to the explicit forms of Γ_{g_m} ($m = 1, 2, 3, 4$),

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\varphi^1 &= -4i (\text{Im } \bar{\epsilon}) \tilde{\Upsilon}, \\ \delta\varphi^2 &= 4i (\text{Im } \bar{\epsilon}) \tilde{\Upsilon}, \\ \delta\tilde{\Upsilon} &= -\frac{i}{32} \Gamma^M (\partial_M \varphi^1 - \partial_M \varphi^2) \epsilon.\end{aligned}\tag{315}$$

Substituting the ten-dimensional complex right-handed Weyl spinor Υ and the supersymmetry transformation parameter ϵ listed in (293) into (315) and using

$$\bar{\epsilon} = \epsilon^\dagger \Gamma_0 = (\bar{\epsilon}^\dagger(x, y), 0) \gamma^0 \otimes 1_4 \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = (0, \bar{\epsilon}(x, y))\tag{316}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\varphi^1(x, y) &= -4i (\text{Im } \bar{\epsilon}) \tilde{\chi}(x, y), \\ \delta\varphi^2(x, y) &= 4i (\text{Im } \bar{\epsilon}) \tilde{\chi}(x, y), \\ \delta\tilde{\chi}(x, y) &= -\frac{i}{32} \left[\gamma^\alpha \partial_\alpha^x (\varphi^1 - \varphi^2) - i\tau^\xi \partial_\xi^y (\varphi^1 - \varphi^2) \right] \tilde{\epsilon}(x, y).\end{aligned}\tag{317}$$

The following task is performing compactification on $T^{1,1}$ and reducing above supersymmetric transformations to five dimensions. That is, we expand $\varphi^p(x, y)$ ($p = 1, 2$), $\tilde{\chi}(x, y)$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}(x, y)$ in terms of scalar- and spinor $U_H(1)$ harmonics as shown in (294), and then insert these expansions into Eq. (317). Taking into account only zero modes in the expansions and comparing both sides of Eq. (317), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\widehat{\chi}^i &= -\frac{i}{32}f_p^{ij}\widehat{\gamma}^\alpha\partial_\alpha\varphi^p\widehat{\eta}_j, \\ \delta\widehat{\varphi}^p &= 4if_{ij}^p\widehat{\eta}^i\widehat{\chi}^j.\end{aligned}\tag{318}$$

In above equation, $f_p^{ij} \equiv \delta^{ij}N^{jp}$ (j is not summed), $i, j = 1, 2$ are the indices labeling fermions with opposite $U_R(1)$ -charges, which arise naturally in performing the compactification of fermionic fields on $T^{1,1}$; N^{jp} are defined as the following:

$$N^{11} = N^{21} = 1, \quad N^{12} = N^{22} = -1.\tag{319}$$

f_{ij}^p is related to f_p^{ij} in the following way:

$$f_{ij}^p \equiv \epsilon^{pq}\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}f_q^{kl}, \quad \epsilon^{12} = -\epsilon^{21} = 1.\tag{320}$$

Eq. (318) together with (319) and (320) is exactly the supersymmetry transformation for $\mathcal{N} = 2$ hypermultiplet in five-dimensions [19,119].

We should further take the hypermultiplet (ϕ^p, χ^i) to the boundary of AdS_5 space. In principle, we can take a similar procedure as in initiated in Ref. [4] and carried out explicitly in Ref. [22,23], where on-shell fields in gauged AdS_{d+1} supergravity can reduce to off-shell fields of d -dimensional conformal supergravity on AdS_{d+1} boundary. However, here the equations of motion for φ^p and χ^i are not clear. We naively require their behaviors near the AdS_5 boundary according to the physical reasonableness. A careful analysis shows that near the AdS_5 boundary Eq. (318) may convert into the supersymmetry transformation for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ chiral supermultiplet in four dimensions. This means that as expected from the holographic version on gauge/gravity correspondence, the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Goldstone supermultiplet (ϕ^p, χ^i) in the AdS_5 space can constitute a chiral supermultiplet on AdS_5 boundary, which corresponds exactly to the superconformal anomaly multiplet of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric gauge theory in four dimensions.

VII. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We have highlighted that there exist two types of superconformal anomalies in a four-dimensional classically conformal invariant supersymmetric gauge theory and they have distinct gravitational correspondences in the gauge/gravity dual. One type of superconformal anomaly arises when the supersymmetric gauge theory couples with an external conformal supergravity background and its existence depends on the non-trivial topology of the field configuration of the external conformal supergravity background, which is usually called the external superconformal anomaly [9,10]. The other one originates purely from the dynamics of the supersymmetric gauge theory itself and its anomaly coefficient is proportional to the beta function of the theory. It has nothing to do with the external field background and is usually called the internal superconformal anomaly [9,10].

We have emphasized that the external superconformal anomaly can be partially calculated from the AdS/CFT correspondence at the supergravity level, i.e., the holographic version of the gauge/gravity dual. The AdS/CFT correspondence conjecture at supergravity level, after the compactification on the compact five-dimensional Einstein manifold, predicts that there should exist a holographic correspondence between the gauged AdS_5 supergravity

and the superconformal gauge theory on the boundary of AdS_5 space. The off-shell conformal supergravity in four dimensions plays the role of an intermedium: on one hand, it comes from the on-shell five-dimensional gauged supergravity around its AdS_5 vacuum configuration and the superconformal symmetry of the conformal supergravity is relevant to boundary decomposition of the AdS_5 supersymmetry; on the other hand, the four-dimensional conformal supergravity furnishes an external field background for the four-dimensional classically conformal invariant supersymmetric gauge theory and hence the various conservation laws in the supersymmetric gauge theory can be reflected in the preservation of the local symmetries in conformal supergravity. These relations provide the justifications why the external superconformal anomaly can be evaluated from the gauged AdS_5 supergravity. Of course, since the holography between the gauged AdS_5 supergravity and four-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theory is only the lowest-order approximation to the AdS/CFT correspondence, so only partial results of the external superconformal anomaly can be reproduced. One must go to the AdS/CFT correspondence at string level to get the whole external superconformal anomaly.

We have found the dual correspondence of the internal superconformal anomaly. We first figure out that the internal superconformal anomaly reflects in the quantum effective action as the running of gauge coupling and the shift of the CP-violation parameter as well as the shift their superpartner in superspace. Further, we make use of the two distinct features of D-branes in the weakly- and strongly coupled type II superstring theory. In a weakly coupled case, a D -brane behaves as a geometric and dynamical object from which a supersymmetric gauge theory can be extracted out; While in the strongly coupled case, the D-brane arises as a solution to the type II supergravity, the low-energy effective theory of type II superstring theory. Based on this fact, we realize that the fractional branes in non-perturbative string theory are the source of the internal superconformal anomaly. Then we go to the strongly coupled side of type II superstring theory and have observed that the same fractional branes deform the brane solution. This brane solution is obtained in the absence of fractional branes and its near-horizon limit is the product of the AdS_5 space and a compact five-dimensional Einstein manifold X^5 . Choosing the brane solution as a vacuum configuration of type II supergravity, we get a five-dimensional gauged supergravity since the compactification on the compact Einstein manifold will occur and its isometry symmetry will become the gauge symmetry of the gauged supergravity. The deformation on $AdS_5 \times X^5$ makes the space-time background less symmetric. Therefore, we obtain a gauged AdS_5 supergravity with spontaneously broken gauge symmetry and consequently the super-Higgs mechanism will take place. Since the origin of this super-Higgs mechanism is exactly the fraction branes that lead to the internal superconformal anomaly. We thus claim the dual of internal superconformal anomaly of a four-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theory is the super-Higgs mechanism in the gauged AdS_5 supergravity.

Anomaly is a typical quantum phenomenon in gauge field theory. Therefore, a clear understanding to the gravitational correspondences of these two types of superconformal anomaly will be significant for the comprehension on the gauge/gravity duality.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Professor M. Chaichian and Professor R. Jackiw for continuous encouragement. During doing this project I have been benefited from discussions, conversations and communications with O. Aharony, A. Buchel, E. Bergshoeff, C. Burgess, C.T. Chan, B. de Wit, M. Grisar, M. Günaydin, M. Henningson, A. Kobakhidze, M. Nishmura, C. Núñez and Y. Yang and hence acknowledge here. I would also like to thank my colleagues at the string theory group of Taiwan for comments when I gave several seminars relevant to this topic. Last but not the least, I would like to thank Professors S. Bulman-Flemming, D. Vaughan and E. Wang in the Department of Mathematics of the Wilfrid Laurier University for various helps and encouragements. This work is partially supported by the National Research Council of Taiwan through NCTS under the grant NSC 94-2119-M-002-001 and the Faculty of Science, Wilfrid Laurier University.

REFERENCES

- [1] I.R. Klebanov, P. Ouyang and E. Witten, Phys. Rev. **D65** (2002) 105007.
- [2] J. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 231.
- [3] S.S. Gubser, I.R. Klebanov and A.M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **B428** (1998) 105.
- [4] E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 253.
- [5] M. Henningson and K. Skenderis, JHEP **9807** (1998) 023; Fortsch. Phys. **48** (2000) 125.
- [6] R. Crewther, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28** (1972) 1421 M. Chanovitz and J. Ellis, Phys. Lett. **B40** (1972) 397; S.L. Adler, J.C. Collins and A. Duncan, Phys. Rev. **D15** (1977) 1512; J.C. Collins, A. Duncan and S.D. Joglekar, Phys. Rev. **D16** (1977) 438; N.K. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. **B120** (1977) 212.
- [7] L.F. Abbott, M.T. Grisaru and H.J. Schnitzer, Phys. Lett. **B71** (1977) 161, Phys. Rev. **D16** (1977) 2995; T. Curtright, Phys. Lett. **B71** (1977) 185.
- [8] S.M. Christensen and M.J. Duff, Phys. Lett. **B76** (1978) 571.
- [9] For a brief review, see M.T. Grisaru, *Anomalies in Supersymmetric Theories*, Invited talk given at NATO Advanced Study Institute on Gravitation: *Recent Developments*, Cargese, France, Jul 10-29, 1978.
- [10] D. Anselmi, D.Z. Freedman, M.T. Grisaru and A.A. Johansen, Nucl. Phys. **B526** (1998) 543.
- [11] I. Drummond and G.M. Shore, Phys. Rev. **D19** (1979) 1134; *ibid* **D21** (1980) 958; G.M. Shore, Phys. Rev. **D21** (1980) 2226; S.J. Hathrell, Ann. Phys. **139** (1982) 136; *ibid* **142** (1982) 34.
- [12] J. Iliopoulos and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. **B76** (1974) 310; S. Ferrara and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. **B87** (1975) 207.
- [13] For reviews, see M.F. Sohnius, Phys. Rep. **128** (1985) 39; M. Chaichian, W.F. Chen and C. Montonen, Phys. Rep. **346** (2001) 89.
- [14] For a review, see M.B. Green, J.H. Schwarz and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory*, Volum II, Chapter 13.
- [15] P.G.O. Freund and M.A. Rubin, Phys. Lett. **B97** (1980) 233.
- [16] M.J. Duff and C.N. Pope, Nucl.Phys. **B255** (1985) 355.
- [17] M. Günaydin and N. Marcus, Class. Quantum Grav. **2** (1985) L11.
- [18] H.J. Kim, L.J. Romans and P. Van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. **D32** (1985) 389.
- [19] M. Günaydin, L. J. Romans and N.P. Warner, Phys. Lett. **B154** (1985) 268; Nucl. Phys. **272** (1986) 598; M. Günaydin, G. Sierra and P.K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B242** (1984) 244; *ibid* **B253** (1985) 573.
- [20] S. Ferrara, M. Kaku, P.K. Townsend, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Nucl. Phys. **B129** (1977) 125; M. Kaku, P.K. Townsend, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. **D17** (1978) 3179; Phys. Lett. **B69** (1977) 304; J. Crispim-Romao, Nucl. Phys. **B145** (1978) 535; T. Kugo and S. Uehara, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1983) 49.
- [21] For reviews see E.S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, Phys. Rep. **119** (1985) 233; P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rep. **68** (1981) 189.
- [22] M. Nishimura and Y. Tanii, Phys. Lett. **B446** (1999) 37; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A14** (1999) 3731; Mod. Phys. Lett. **A14** (1999) 2709; Nucl. Phys. **B588** (2000) 471.
- [23] V. Balasubramanian, E. Gimon, D. Minic and J. Rahmfeld, Phys. Rev. **D63** (2001) 104009.

- [24] For reviews see M. Chaichian and W.F. Chen, *Superconformal Anomaly from AdS/CFT Correspondence*, Contributed to Workshop on “*Symmetries in Gravity and Field Theory*: In Honor of Prof. J.A. de Azcarraga, June, 2003; *The Holographic Superconformal Anomaly*, Proceedings of the Gunnar Nordström Symposium on Theoretical Physics, Commentationes PHYSICO-MATHEMATICAE 166/2004, edited by C. Cronström and C. Montonen, P. 27-41, published by Societas Scientiarum Fennica, the Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters.
- [25] C. Imbimbo, A. Schwimmer, S. Theisen and S. Yankielowicz, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17** (2000) 1129.
- [26] M. Chaichian and W.F. Chen, *Nucl. Phys.* **B678** (2004) 317.
- [27] C.G. Callan, D. Friedan, E.J. Martinec and M.J. Perry, *Nucl. Phys.* **B262** (1985) 293; L.J. Romans and N.P. Warner, *Nucl. Phys.* **B273** (1986) 320; E. Bergshoeff, A. Salam and E. Sezgin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B279** (1987) 659; Y. Cai and C. Nunez, *Nucl. Phys.* **B287** (1987) 279; D.J. Gross and J.H. Sloan, *Nucl. Phys.* **B291** (1987) 41; C.M. Hull and P.K. Townsend, *Nucl. Phys.* **B301** (1988) 197; E. Bergshoeff and M. de Roo, *Nucl. Phys.* **B328** (1989) 439.
- [28] O. Aharony, J. Pawelczyk, S. Theisen and S. Yankielowicz, *Phys. Rev.* **D60** (1999) 066001; P. Mansfield and D. Nolland, *Phys. Lett.* **B495** (2000) 435; S.G. Naculich, H.J. Schnitzer and N. Wyllard, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A17** (2002) 2567.
- [29] M. Blau, K.S. Narain and E. Gava, *JHEP* **9909** (1999) 018.
- [30] C.G. Callan and J.A. Harvey, *Nucl. Phys.* **B250** (1985) 427; S. Naculich, *Nucl. Phys.* **B296** (1988) 837.
- [31] For a review, see O. Aharony, S.S. Gubser, J. Maldacena, H. Ooguri and Y. Oz, *Phys. Rept.* **323** (2000) 183.
- [32] J. Polchinski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995) 4724.
- [33] A. Giveon and D. Kutasov, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **71** (1999) 983.
- [34] For reviews, see P. Di Vecchia and A. Liccardo, *D Branes in String Theory: I, II*, [hep-th/9912161](#); [hep-th/9912275](#); *Gauge Theories from D Branes*, [hep-th/0307104](#).
- [35] For a review, see K.S. Stelle, *BPS Branes in Supergravity*, [hep-th/9803116](#).
- [36] For a review see F. Bigazzi, A.L. Cotrone, M. Petrini and A. Zaffroni, *Supergravity Duals of Supersymmetric Four Dimensional Gauge theories*, [hep-th/0303191](#).
- [37] W.F. Chen, *Gravity Dual of Superconformal Anomaly*, [hep-th/0508112](#); submitted to **Nucl. Phys.B**.
- [38] I.R. Klebanov and A.A. Tseytlin, *Nucl.Phys.* **B578** (2000) 123.
- [39] S. Deser and A. Schwimmer, *Phys. Lett.* **B309** (1993) 279.
- [40] For earlier relevant works see I.R. Klebanov, *Nucl.Phys.* **B496** (1997) 231; S.S. Gubser, I.R. Klebanov and A.A. Tseytlin, *Nucl.Phys.* **B499** (1997) 217; S.S. Gubser and I.R. Klebanov, *Phys. Lett.* **B413** (1997) 41.
- [41] H.J. Boonstra, K. Skenderis and P.K. Townsend, *JHEP* **9807** (1998) 023.
- [42] R. Manvelian and A. C. Petkou, *JHEP* **0006** (2000) 003.
- [43] M. Bertolini, P.Di Vecchia, M. Frau, A. Lerda and R. Marotta, *More Anomalies from Fractional Branes*, [hep-th/0202195](#).
- [44] M. Bertolini, P.Di Vecchia, G. Ferretti and R. Marotta, [hep-th/0112187](#).
- [45] M. Bertolini, P.Di Vecchia, M. Frau, A. Lerda, R. Marotta and I. Pesando,

- hep-th/0011077.
- [46] M. Bertolini, P.Di Vecchia and R. Marotta, hep-th/0112195.
 - [47] G. 't Hooft, *Dimensional Reduction in Quantum Gravity*, gr-qc/9310026.
 - [48] L. Susskind, J. Math. Phys. **36** (1995) 6377.
 - [49] I.R. Klebanov and M.J. Strassler, hep-th/0007191.
 - [50] I.R. Klebanov and N.A. Nekrasov, hep-th/9911096.
 - [51] D. Berenstein, C.P. Herzog and I.R. Klebanov, hep-th/0202150.
 - [52] S.S. Gubser and I.R. Klebanov, hep-th/9808075.
 - [53] A. Salam and J. Strathdee, Nucl. Phys. **B16** (1974) 411; S. Ferrara, J. Wess and B. Zumino, Phys. Lett. **B51** (1974) 239.
 - [54] For a review, see R.A. Bertlmann, *Anomalies in Quantum Field Theories* (Oxford University Press, 1996).
 - [55] D.M. Capper and M.J. Duff, Nuovo Cimento, **23A** (1974) 173; A. Duncan, Phys. Lett. **B66** (1977) 170; J.S. Dowker and R. Critchley, Phys. Rev. **D16** (1977) 3390; H.S. Tsao, Phys. Lett. **B68** (1977) 79. M. J. Duff, Nucl.Phys. **B125** (1977) 334.
 - [56] I. Drummond and S.J. Hathrell, Phys. Rev. **D21** (1980) 958; S.J. Hathrell, Ann. Phys. **139** (1982) 136; *ibid* **142** (1982) 34.
 - [57] R.D. Peccei and H.R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. **D16** (1977) 1791.
 - [58] A.W. Fisher, Nucl. Phys. **B229** (1983) 142; *ibid* **B241** (1984) 243.
 - [59] B. de Wit and D.Z. Freedman, Phys. Rev. **D12** (1975) 2486; M.F. Sohnius, Phys. Lett. **B81** (1979) 8.
 - [60] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo and B. de Wit, Nucl. Phys. **B182** (1981) 173.
 - [61] S. Marculescu, Phys. Lett. **B188** (1987) 203.
 - [62] P. Howe, K. Stelle and P. West, Phys. Lett. **B124** (1983) 55.
 - [63] M.F. Sohnius and P.C. West, Phys. Lett. **B100** (1981) 245.
 - [64] E. Cremmer, J. Scherk and J.H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **B84** (1979) 83.
 - [65] E. Cremmer, in *Superspace and Supergravity*, ed. by S.W. Hawking and M. Roček (Cambridge University Press, 1981).
 - [66] M. Günaydin, L. J. Romans and N.P. Warner, Phys. Lett. **B154** (1985) 268; Nucl. Phys. **272** (1986) 598.
 - [67] G.W. Gibbons, C.M. Hull and N.P. Warner, Nucl. Phys. **B218** (1983) 173.
 - [68] P. van Nieuwenhuizen and N.P. Warner, Commun. Math. Phys. **93** (1984) 277.
 - [69] D.Z. Freedman, S.S: Gubser, K. Pilch and N.P. Warner, JHEP 0007 (2000) 038.
 - [70] D.Z. Freedman, S.S: Gubser, K. Pilch and N.P. Warner, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.**3** (1999) 363.
 - [71] B. Zumino, Y.S. Wu and A. Zee, Nucl. Phys. **B239** (1984) 477; L. Alvarez-Gaume and P. Ginsparg, Nucl. Phys. **B243** (1984) 449; Annals Phys. **161** (1985) 423.
 - [72] J. Wess and B. Zumino, Phys. Lett. **B37** (1971) 95.
 - [73] S. Ferrara, C. Fronsdal and A. Zaffaroni, Nucl. Phys. **B532** (1998) 153; S. Ferrara and A. Zaffaroni, Phys. Lett. **B431** (1998) 49.
 - [74] L.J. Romans, Phys. Lett. **B153** (1984) 401.
 - [75] I.R. Klebanov and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B536** (1998) 536.
 - [76] S. Kachru and E. Silverstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998) 4855.
 - [77] A. Lawrence, N. Nekrasov and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. **B533** (1998) 199.
 - [78] N.A. Novikov, M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B229**

- (1983) 381.
- [79] N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. **B435** (1995) 129.
 - [80] R.G. Leigh and M.J. Strassler, Nucl. Phys. **B447** (1995) 95.
 - [81] For earlier works discussing on the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superconformal symmetry based on the perturbative β -function, see P. West, Phys. Lett. **B137** (1984) 371; A. Parkes and P. West, Phys. Lett. **B138** (1984) 99; D.R.T. Jones and L. Mezincescu, Phys. Lett. **B138** (1984) 293; S. Hamidi, J. Patera and J. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **B141** (1984) 349; W. Lucha and H. Neufeld, Phys. Lett. **B174** (1986) 186; P. Piguet, K. Sibold, Phys. Lett. **B177** (1986) 373; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A1** (1986) 913; Phys. Lett. **B201** (1988) 241; C. Lucchesi, O. Piguet and K. Sibold, Helv. Phys. Acta, **61** (1988) 321. D.R. T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. **B277** (1986) 153; A.V. Ermushev, D.I. Kazakov and O.V. Tarasov, Nucl. Phys. **B281** (1987) 72; X.D. Jiang and X.J. Zhou, Phys. Lett. **B197** (1987) 156; Phys. Lett. **B216** (1989) 160; Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 2109.
 - [82] For earlier works discussing on the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ superconformal symmetry based on the perturbative β -function, see P. Howe, K. Stelle and P. West, Phys. Lett. **B124** (1983) 55; I.G. Koh and S. Rajpoot, Phys. Lett. **B135** (1984) 397; F.X. Dong, T.S. Tu, P.Y. Xue and X.J. Zhou, Phys. Lett. **B140** (1984) 333; J.P. Derendinger, S. Ferrara and A. Masiero, Phys. Lett. **B143** (1984) 133.
 - [83] H. Liu and A.A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. **B533** (1998) 88.
 - [84] M. Awada and P.K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **255** (1985) 617.
 - [85] L.J. Romans, Nucl. Phys. **B267** (1986) 433.
 - [86] G. Dall’Agata, C. Herrmann and M. Zagermann, Nucl.Phys. **B612** (2001) 123.
 - [87] M. Chaichian and W.F. Chen, $\mathcal{N} = 2$ *Off-Shell Conformal Supersupergravity in Four Dimensions from $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Five-dimensional On-Shell Gauged Supergravity and the Holographic Super-Weyl Anomaly*, to appear.
 - [88] S. Ferrara and A. Zaffaroni, Phys. Lett. **B431** (1988) 4956.
 - [89] For a recent discussion relevant to $5 - D$ $N = 2$ gauged supergravity, see M. Günaydin and M. Zigermann, hep-th/9912027; hep-th/0002228; A. Ceresole and G. Dall’Agata, hep-th/0004111.
 - [90] S. Deser and A. Schwimmer, Phys. Lett. **B309** (1993) 279.
 - [91] I.R. Klebanov and E. Witten, Nucl.Phys. **B536** (1998) 199.
 - [92] S.S. Gubser, hep-th/9807164.
 - [93] O. Aharony, J. Pawłczyk, S. Theisen and S. Yankielowicz, Phys. Rev. **D60** (1999) 066001.
 - [94] A. Bilal and C.S. Chu, Nucl. Phys. **B562** (1999) 181.
 - [95] W.A. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. **184** (1969) 1848; Nucl. Phys. **B75** (1974) 246; W.A. Bardeen and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. **B253** (1985) 635.
 - [96] For a review, see R.A. Bertlmann, *Anomalies in Quantum Field Theories* (Oxford University Press, 1996).
 - [97] S. de Haro, K. Skenderis and S.N. Solodukhin, Commun. Math. Phys. **217** (2001) 595.
 - [98] M. Bianchi, D.Z. Freedman and K. Skenderis, hep-th/0112119; hep-th/0105276.
 - [99] M. Bianchi, O. DeWolfe, D.Z. Freedman and K. Pilch, hep-th/0009156.
 - [100] See for example, A. van Proeyen, *Tools for Supersymmetry*, hep-th/9910030.
 - [101] For a review, see J. Polchinski, *String Theory*, Volume I, Chapter 8.
 - [102] M. Bertolini, P.Di Vecchia, G. Ferretti and R. Marotta, Nucl. Phys. **B630** (2002) 222;

- M. Bertolini, P.Di Vecchia and R. Marotta, Phys. Lett. **B540** (2002) 104.
- [103] For a review, see C.V. Johnson, *D-brane Primer*, hep-th/0007170, Chapters 9, 10.
 - [104] I.R. Klebanov and A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. **B574** (2000) 123.
 - [105] D. Areán, D.E. Crooks and A.V. Ramallo, JHEP **0411** (2004) 035.
 - [106] J. Schwarz and P. West, Phys. Lett. **B126** (1983) 301; J. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1983) 226; P. Howe and P. West, *ibid* **238** (1984) 181; M. Graña and J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. **D63** (2000) 026001.
 - [107] H. Lü, C.N. Pope and P.K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. **B391** (1997) 39.
 - [108] M. Günaydin and N. Marcus, Class. Quantum Grav. **2** (1985) L11.
 - [109] For a review, see D. Bailin and A. Love, Rept. Prog. Phys. **50** (1987) 1087.
 - [110] S. Ferrara, C. Fronsda and A. Zaffaroni, Nucl. Phys. **B532** (1998) 153; S. Ferrara and A. Zaffaroni, Phys. Lett. **B431** (1998) 49.
 - [111] M.J. Duff, B.E.W. Nilsson and C.N. Pope, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50** (1983) 2043. For a review, see M.J. Duff, B.E.W. Nilsson and C.N. Pope, Phys. Rep., **130** (1986) 1.
 - [112] A. Ceresole, G. Dall’Agata, R. D’Auria and S. Ferrara, Phys. Rev. **D61** (2000) 066001; A. Ceresole, G. Dall’Agata and R. D’Auria, JHEP **11** (1999) 009.
 - [113] A. Salam and J.A. Strathdee, Annals Phys. **141** (1982) 316.
 - [114] A. Higuchi, Nucl. Phys. **B282** (1987) 397; *ibid* **B325** (1989) 745; L.F. Abbott and S. Deser, *ibid* **B195** (1982) 76; H. van Dam and M. Veltman, *ibid* **B22** (1970) 397.
 - [115] M. Proratti, JHEP **0204** (2002) 058; Mod. Phys. Lett. **A18** (2003) 1793.
 - [116] M. Fierz and W. Pauli, Proc. Roy. Soc. **173** (1939) 211; Helv. Phys. Acta. **12** (1939) 3.
 - [117] P. K. Townsend, Phys. Rev. **D15** (1977) 2802.
 - [118] S. Deser and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38** (1977) 1433; E. Cremmer, B. Julia, J. Scherk, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, S. Ferrara and L. Girardello, Phys. Lett. **B79** (1978) 231; Nucl. Phys. **B147** (1979) 105.
 - [119] G. Sierra, Phys. Lett. **B157** (1985) 379; M. Günaydin and M. Zagermann, Nucl. Phys. **B572** (2000) 131; Phys. Rev. **D63** (2001) 064023; J. Ellis, M. Günaydin and M. Zagermann, JHEP **0111** (2001) 024.
 - [120] M. Krasnitz, JHEP **12** (2002) 048.